1997

The prophet and the preacher : an exploration of charismatic leadership in two American religious movements

Stefanie R. Mathew

The Prophet and the Preacher:

An Exploration of Charismatic Leadership in Two American Religious Movements

By

Stefanie R. Mathew

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

Richmond, VA

April, 1997

The Prophet and the Preacher: An Exploration of Charismatic Leadership in Two American Religious Movements

by
Stefanie R. Mathew

Senior Project
Jepson School of Leadership Studies
University of Richmond
Richmond, Virginia

April 1997

The Prophet and the Preacher: An Exploration of Charismatic Leadership in Two American Religious Movements

In the modern era, the growing trend of secularization has replaced religion in the hearts and minds of many Americans. A number of the old unanswerable questions have now been answered, due to the amazing advances that have been achieved in the fields of science and technology. Some even argue that modernization has reduced the relevance of religion in the modern world (Bruce 1). In spite of this trend, there is evidence that religion in America is not an anachronism quite yet.

In the past two decades, in fact, a number of religious movements have captured the attention, and allegiance, of many Americans. These religious movements represent a type of belief system that has not been seen in this country for a long time: extremely devoted believers following a single, powerful, charismatic-style leader. Two such leaders, David Koresh and Jerry Falwell, have become icons themselves, as they have led their people in the name of God and demonstrated to the rest of society that there is still a place for religion in America.

How have these men been able to maintain such devout religious followings, committed to agendas that did not necessarily mesh with the larger society, in the increasingly secular late-twentieth century? Although the elements of the leadership situation for each differs greatly, this paper will argue that they have one thing in common: both of these men, through a variety of methods, have acted as charismatic leaders for their followers. The following paper will investigate the particular methods of each leader, and analyze how the presence or semblance of charismatic leadership has shaped the history of each movement.

This study arose out of a desire to integrate two academic disciplines, leadership studies and religion. This particular project developed out of a longing to explore the connections between the two subjects. Although a great deal of research on the nature of charismatic leadership in corporate, political, and social settings has been presented in the curriculum of the Jepson School, especially in the context courses, there seemed to be a lack of material that considered charisma in a religious context. Based upon this observation, as well as the author's specific interest in studying religious groups that fall outside of the American mainstream and a curiosity about the methods of the two particular leaders in question, the study that follows emerged out of an amorphous collection of ideas about religion and leadership in general and grew into an examination of the leadership styles of the two aforementioned figures. The scholarly purpose of this paper is to further the study of charismatic leadership in modern American society by extending it into a specific context, that of radical religious groups of the late twentieth century.

Methodology

This paper is the result of an investigation of charismatic leadership in two different religious movements: the Branch Davidians of Mount Carmel, Texas, and the ministries of Jerry Falwell in Lynchburg, Virginia. This study addresses the following two questions:

- *How did David Koresh's leadership style impact the tragic events that occurred at the Branch Davidians' Mount Carmel compound in the spring of 1993?*
- *How has Jerry Falwell led members of a formerly isolationist religious sect into an active role in mainstream American politics and society?*

This paper will attempt to show that the answers to both of these questions lie in the charismatic leadership styles of both David Koresh and Jerry Falwell.

Because of the context-specific nature of the project, this report was conducted through the use of the case study method of research. A case study is "an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin 23). The first two components of a case study clearly match the nature of this research project, as it focuses upon the two leaders each in their own unique context. Also, regardless of the differences between them, both are context-specific; that is, they are both religious leaders. Because of this, it was necessary to study each of these men from within his own context, thus mandating a case study approach.

The nature of the research questions driving this study also indicated the need for the case study method. According to Robert K. Yin, case studies are most appropriate when the research questions being addressed ask "how" or "why" something happens (13). This study asks both of these questions. Through the development of the case studies, the "how" questions mentioned above will be addressed.

Questions such as those guiding this study can only be analyzed and addressed after sufficient background information, in the form of case studies, has been presented. This paper's case studies present the history of each religious movement, each leader's rise to power, and the events that have led up to each group's current situation. These details of the religious movements, and the insights that they provide into each man's leadership style, constitute a significant portion of the data for this project.

The second body of data for this study comes from the field of leadership studies. As this paper investigates charismatic leadership, it was necessary to research many of the leading contemporary theories regarding this topic. The results of the exploration of this aspect of leadership theory can be found in the literature review of this paper. The theories that appear in the literature review comprise a conceptual framework of charismatic leadership, which is used to analyze the leadership styles of both David Koresh and Jerry Falwell at the end of each man's

respective case study.

The methods of traditional research, document analysis, and direct observation were employed in the collection of data for this project. A great deal of the historical background information for both of the case studies, as well as all of the material regarding charismatic leadership, was collected through traditional research means. A number of sources were consulted in this investigation. News articles, scholarly books and journals, and religion and sociology textbooks all proved to be useful resources in the investigation of the two case studies. In addition, Dr. Frank Eakin, Dr. Robison James and Dr. Theodore Bergren, faculty members in the University of Richmond's Religion Department, were also very helpful in the clarification of certain questions regarding theology. Scholarly journals in the fields of leadership studies, psychology, sociology, and management provided much of the information on charismatic leadership that is included in the paper. Three leadership texts, Wren's *The Leader's Companion*, Yukl's *Leadership in Organizations*, and Hughes et al.'s *Leadership*, were also very useful sources, as they introduce many of the key concepts that are central to an understanding of charismatic leadership, and leadership in general.

Document analysis, a method common to qualitative research, requires the researcher to evaluate both the "manifest and latent" significance of a particular article, record, speech, communication, et cetera (Light 46, Yin 85). This particular method of data collection was used in the treatment of several of Reverend Falwell's sermons and an unfinished manuscript by David Koresh. Falwell's sermons were obtained through the broadcast of his "Old Time Gospel Hour" and at the Thomas Road Baptist Church's site on the World Wide Web. Koresh's manuscript appears in the appendix of Tabor and Gallagher's *Why Waco? Cults and the Battle for Religious Freedom*. These primary sources were analyzed for their content, with special notice taken of the symbolism and rhetorical techniques used in each.

The information-gathering method of participant observation was also employed in the completion of this research. Participant observation is a research method that requires the researcher to place him or herself within the context of the individual subject, becoming a primary witness to the events which he or she is studying (Light 48). For this study, the author attended the morning Worship Service at Reverend Falwell's Thomas Road Baptist Church on Sunday, February 16, 1997. Information and first-hand impressions were collected as the author studied Reverend Falwell from within his own context.

Once the research on the case studies was completed, the formal analysis phase of this project began. This analysis consisted of a weighing of the information in the case studies against the framework of the specific charismatic leadership theories identified in the literature review. Using each theory as a lens through which the case studies should be viewed, the author was able to draw conclusions regarding the nature and impact of charismatic leadership in each individual case. Events, behaviors, characteristics, and situations in either case that fit the patterns dictated by the theories were noted, and their explanations and the conclusions drawn from them appear in the analysis section of this paper.

There are a few limitations to the aforementioned methodology that need to be noted. Because of the nature of this project, the fact that it deals with such issues as religious beliefs, the freedom of religion, politics, government intervention, and death, there is sure to be bias built into many of the sources used. This paper will be a qualitative, subjective product, the result of the author's personal conclusions based upon her own survey and presentation of the historical "facts" surrounding both men. Though the author has made a concerted effort to remain objective, the possibility of bias from a number of different directions should be noted.

In addition to bias, another limitation of this study of Koresh and Falwell is the question of belief: are these men sincere in their theology, and all of its applications, or not? Because the author is not in any position to answer this question either positively or negatively, this paper attempts to avoid any problems related to this issue by presenting its findings based on both perspectives. The analysis of each leadership theory, essentially, was conducted twice for each case study: the first, studying the ramifications of the theory if the leader in question believed what he was preaching, and the second as if he did not. The reason for this distinction is that the relevance of some of the theories changes based upon the assumption of sincerity or insincerity in the case. In each case, the findings based upon each perspective are presented.

Religion in the Modern World

Before this study could be completed, working definitions of several of the key religious terms involved in the cases and in the religious literature needed to be clarified. Words such as "religion," "church," "sect," "denomination," and "cult" often have different meanings in secular discourse than in religious scholarship. The section that follows establishes definitions of these words as they are used in this paper.

In the past few centuries, there has been considerable debate over how religion should be defined. Scholars with backgrounds as varied as Sigmund Freud, Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Clifford Geertz have all presented their own theories on the subject. Although these and other theories differ greatly, sociologists have categorized the main conceptualizations of religion into two types: functional and substantive theories. Functional theories of religion attempt to define it as what purpose it serves to a society or to an individual. For example, a functionalist theory might claim that religion is a means of providing answers to the great mysteries of life, such as what we are and why we are here (Bruce 6). Substantive theories, on the other hand, do not focus on the role that religion plays in a society. Instead, a substantive definition of religion attempts to explain what religion is in and of itself. This type of definition would most likely include the ideas that a religion is a belief system or a set of ritual traditions related to the idea of the supernatural or divine (Bruce 6). This study uses the definition of religion proposed by Emile Durkheim in his text, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*:

> A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden - beliefs

> and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them. (62)

This definition approaches religion from both a functional and substantive perspective. Durkheim identifies the purpose, or function, of religion as the ability to unite its adherents into a single community with a shared morality. He also described the substance of religion, that it is a system of beliefs and practices focused upon the idea of the sacred.

Sociologists have identified four main categories that generally describe modern, organized religion. These categories are churches, sects, denominations, and cults. It is important to note that these categorizations, and the descriptions that follow, are "ideal types" (Light 526). In practice, religious organizations may not fit any of these definitions completely, yet will tend to conform to the basic idealization of one category.

A church tends to be a large, traditional grouping of people that share the same beliefs. Church theology is usually based upon a loose or liberal, instead of literal, interpretation of its sacred texts, and there is an emphasis on the intellectual nature of spirituality. Members usually don't need to convert into this organization, as one is born into the group (Light 526-7). A church is staffed by a professional clergy that tends to lead a distinct lifestyle in their devotion to their faith (Bruce 71). An example of this would be the celibacy of Catholic priests and nuns. These tend to be wealthy, established organizations with a great deal of social and political power. Church members are often middle class members of society, so the organization tends to support the status quo (Light 526, Bruce 71). As we entered the modern era, the church was the dominant form of religion in American mainstream culture.

As churches tend to be conservative organizations hesitant to respond to emerging cultural trends, there have been many instances in history when a dissenting group has broken away from their old order or rebelled and formed a new sort of religion. These splits result in the appearance of what Stark and Bainbridge term religious revivals and religious innovations (Light 530). A religious revival is marked by a group of believers who are disillusioned with the current state of their religion, and decide to "restore more traditional, spiritual features to established religions" (Light 530). A sect is an example of a religious revival. Religious innovation, on the other hand, is defined as "an effort to create new religions or to change existing ones to better meet people's current needs" (530). Denominations and cults are both examples of religious innovations.

Sometimes, congregations within an established church decide to break away in order to adapt to their particular social context, yet the main beliefs of their old order remain intact. These groups are known as denominations (Reid 103). Denominations differ from both the church and the sect in their lack of exclusivity. By definition, denominationalists realize that they do not "have a monopoly of the truth" (Bruce 75). Unlike the members of a church or a sect, these people realize that although their beliefs may be right for them, they are not for everyone. They recognize that other religions may also have found the path to spiritual truth. Instead of hostility or exclusivity, denominationalists tend to practice tolerance in the vast arena of modern religion (Bruce 76). Members of a denomination may achieve their status through a conversion process, or they may be

born into the religion. There is a professional staff of ministers, and the social character of a denomination tends to lie between the church and the sect (Bruce 75).

In contrast to a church, a sect tends to be a small, exclusive group devoted to the attainment of "spiritual perfection" (Light 526). Theology is based upon a strict interpretation of scriptures, and there is an emphasis on emotion instead of intellect (Light 527). Most sects have as their primary focus the eschatological themes of early Christian literature. These include the predictions of the apocalypse at the Millennium, the battle at Armageddon in which the forces of good must face Satan's minions, the imminent return of Christ, and the salvation of the righteous (Bruce 72). Sect members must undergo a conversion process or experience, as they must make the actual decision to join the sect instead of being born into it. People within the sect usually believe themselves to be the select, enlightened few on the path to salvation; they are the only ones that know the truth that other religions hope to discover. They see the outside world as hostile and decadent, and members often adopt strict, spartan lifestyles in order to ensure their own morality (Light 526). Although sects are often short-lived, some of them do expand and eventually develop into churches.

The fourth category of religions is the cult. This type of organization is usually a small, closely knit group of people that place a strong emphasis on individualism. Like the denominations, cults tend to be tolerant of other religious groups in society (Bruce 82). Stark and Bainbridge point out the fact that these groups, examples of religious innovation, are usually in tension with the larger society. They often have weak ties to any previously established religious order, or none at all. In fact, some cults are the result of an entirely new process of creation, based upon a system of beliefs and practices that has never been seen before. Cult founders often proclaim themselves to be the ideal that the old order was pursuing, or the fulfillment of the needs of the new order (Light 527). There are three types of cults: audience cults, client cults, and cult movements. The first type is characterized by a lack of formal organization, with much of the cult activity taking place over the airwaves or through the mail. Client cults are more organized, especially at the top, and the leaders portray themselves as servants to their followers. The final type, the cult movement, develops when either of the first two grows and becomes more tightly organized (Light 527-8).

According to sociologist Roy Wallis, the four types of religious structures can be differentiated by considering both the external perceptions and the self-image of the groups (Bruce 83). In order to measure the external perception of an organization, one must ask whether the group is believed to be respectable or deviant by the larger society. The self-image is determined by asking if the group members believe that they have "a unique grasp of salvational knowledge" (83). Using these two determinants, Wallis constructed a typology that shows both the similarities and differences between the four different types of religion: (Bruce 83)

"A Typology of Ideological Collectivities"

	External Conception	
	Respectable	Deviant
Uniquely Legitimate	**Church**	**Sect**
Internal Conception		
Pluralistically Legitimate	**Denomination**	**Cult**

This chart demonstrates many of the defining characteristics of the four types of religion. Both churches and sects share the belief that they are "uniquely legitimate," that they alone have been enlightened with the truth. However, churches form part of the backbone of mainstream culture while sects tend to be hostile towards the outside world. Denominations and cults are both pluralistic, that is, they both allow for and tolerate a variety of religious beliefs. But, they differ in that denominations are an accepted part of society while the mainstream tends to fear cults as a threat to the social order.

This paper presents examples of both sects and cults. The Fundamentalist Movement, as represented by Jerry Falwell, fits the general description given of a sect. As will be seen in the case studies, historically, this movement has been conservative and isolationist, favoring a strict interpretation of the Bible and an austere, moral lifestyle. The Branch Davidians fit the description given of cults. Centered around a leader that claimed to be the embodiment of divine truths, this group lived in extreme tension with the outside world, a tension that eventually led to its destruction. Within their movements, each of these leaders has exercised some sort of leadership style particular to the needs of the group and their situation in society. This study investigates their specific use of charismatic leadership.

Charismatic Leadership Theory

The study of charisma, at least in the area of leadership, is a relatively new pursuit. The German sociologist Max Weber proposed the notion that "societies could be identified in terms of one of three types of authority systems: traditional, legal-rational, and charismatic" (Hughes 433). In the first two systems, authority is based upon people's belief in the traditions or laws of a society. In a traditional society, power and authority are handed down in a means that fits with the cultural mores of the group. A monarchy would be an example of this sort of system, with birthright being the reason behind a new leader's claim to power. In a legal-rational system, authority is based upon the laws that govern the society. People follow those in power because they respect the rules that form the backbone of the society (Hughes 433). The United States, with

a highly bureaucratic government based upon a written Constitution devised by the founding fathers, would be an example of a legal-rational authority system.

The third category described by Weber is the charismatic authority system. This system is not based on a set of traditions or laws, but on the authority of a single leader. In Weber's conception of charismatic leadership, followers' perceptions of the leader are a defining element. It is interesting to note that Weber chose to use the word "charisma" to describe a situation which involves an exemplary leader. The term is a Greek word, and its original meaning was "divinely inspired gift" (Yukl 317). Weber's actual definition of charisma is as follows:

> a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them, the individual concerned is treated as a leader. (Weber 358 - 359)

People follow this charismatic individual because they believe that he or she is an extraordinary figure, possessing even "superhuman" or divine qualities. Weber believed that charismatic authority systems usually emerged in a time of crisis or revolution, and that people followed the leader because they felt a strong emotional attachment and personal identification to him or her (Hughes 434).

In the years since Weber's seminal work on charismatic leadership, scholars have continued to pursue the elusive topic and have generated controversy over its exact nature. The main debate has been over the question of where charismatic leadership comes from: is it a result of follower perceptions, leader characteristics, situational conditions, or the relationship between the leaders and followers (Yukl 318, Hughes 434)? According to Yukl, most theorists now see charismatic leadership as a process influenced by all of the factors listed above, as well as "the individual and collective needs of the followers" (Yukl 318).

Much of the research in recent years has focused upon the traits and behaviors of the charismatic leader, and many theories cite the same leader attributes as being necessary components for this type of leadership situation. The framework proposed by Nadler and Tushman provides a general description of the charismatic leader: he or she needs to be "envisioning," "energizing," and "enabling" (Nadler and Tushman 109). A leader needs to articulate a common vision that the people can both identify with and believe in, so that they will feel a strong commitment to the group goal. In order to convey this message, the leader needs to have strong rhetorical skills and the ability to capture the followers' attention and imagination through mere words (Hughes 437). He or she needs to set high expectations for the followers, and needs to live up to them him/herself, as well (Nadler and Tushman 109). In order to energize the people, to spark them into action, a leader needs to be both excited and confident about the group's agenda and abilities (110). The leader tends to use a very personalized leadership style, sparking identification and emotional attachment from the followers. This sort of identification serves to empower and motivate the members of the group (Hughes 439). The charismatic leader also needs to be supportive and provide guidance to the followers, enabling them to perform their tasks successfully (Nadler and

Tushman 110).

The ideas presented above demonstrate the general ideas of many different conceptions of charismatic leadership. However, there are many more specific theories that attempt to describe or explain charismatic leadership in terms of the needs and perceptions of the people involved. This study uses four such theories in its analysis of the case studies: House and Howell's personality theory of charismatic leadership; Conger and Kanungo's attribution theory; a self-concept theory proposed by Shamir, House and Arthur; and the psychoanalytic approach of Kets de Vries and Miller (Yukl 318 - 328).

House and Howell's Theory of Personality and Charismatic Leadership

Robert J. House and Jane M. Howell have targeted one specific component of charismatic leadership, the charismatic leader, and investigated the role of that individual's personality in the leadership mix. These two scholars identified two different types of charismatic leadership: personalized and socialized. Personalized charismatic leaders tend to influence their followers through dominance and authoritarian behavior. They are self-aggrandizing, and often are only focused upon their own self-interests. They exploit the needs and emotions of their followers and the other people around them, and "tend to be narcissistic, impetuous, and impulsively aggressive" (House and Howell 84). In contrast, socialized leaders are much more focused on collective interests and the empowerment of their followers. These leaders tend to be altruistic and egalitarian, more concerned with the needs of the followers than with their own (84). It is important to note that individuals can exhibit traits or behaviors associated with both types of leaders, as the labels describe the concepts in their extremes (84).

According to House and Howell's personality theory, there are several traits of a charismatic leader that help to identify the individual as either a personalized or socialized leader. These traits are: a need for power, Machiavellianism, narcissism, authoritarianism, and self-efficacy. A need for power is defined as "a measure of nonconscious motivation to have an impact on others or one's environment" (85). Leaders with a high need for power tend to be self-aggrandizing, assertive, deceitful, and exploitative. These individuals would rather be rebellious than cooperative.They often place a high level of significance on symbols of power or success, such as a flashy or expensive car (95). A leader with a high need for power is most likely a personalized leader.

Machiavellianism, named after the author of the infamous social commentary, *The Prince*, describes a leader's tendency to place his or her own interests ahead of those of the followers, even to the point of sacrificing the group's needs in order to meet his or her personal agenda (96-97). This disposition is measurable, using scales such as the Mach IV or Mach V. Subjects are given scores in either the high ("Cool Syndrome") range or the low ("Soft Touch") range (97). A person that scores in the high Mach range is usually resistant to social influence, controlling, and task-oriented. A low Mach scorer, in contrast, is usually relationship-oriented and open to the influence

or authority of others (97). Personalized leaders usually score in the higher range and socialized leaders are often lower on the scale.

Narcissism as a personality trait has been rather widely researched, and the two authors cite it as a common element of a leader's psychological disposition. The term usually refers to an inflated sense of or a preoccupation with the self. In many cases, it is accompanied by "fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, status, prestige, and superiority;" as well as the belief that the individual is unique and deserving of special favors or entitlements (97). Highly narcissistic individuals tend to be intolerant of others' opinions, especially criticism, they have relationships based upon idealization (97-98). These leaders have an extreme sense of self-confidence and self-righteousness, which often enhance their leadership abilities (98). As might be expected, personalized leaders tend to be more narcissistic than their socialized counterparts.

House and Howell define authoritarianism as a combination of submission, aggression, and conventionalism (98-99). Authoritarian leaders usually submit to the established and legitimate authorities within a society. Yet, they take advantaged of the established social system, using it as a means for discriminating against groups that are of a lower status within the system. These individuals also tend to act within the bounds of conventional social norms and traditions (99). People that rate high in this trait, called "Right Wing Authoritarianism" by scholars, are most likely personalized leaders. They are usually ethnocentric and prejudiced, and twist the problems of their opponents to their own advantage (98, 99).

Another way to distinguish between personalized and socialized charismatic leaders is in their feelings of self-efficacy. These feelings are based upon two leader traits: self-esteem and locus of control (99). Leaders with a high self-esteem and an internal locus of control will most likely be more confident and have higher efficacy expectations. These individuals tend to use rational and supportive influence tactics in their relations with followers; they are the socialized leaders (101). Personalized leaders, on the other hand, often have low self-esteem and an external locus of control. They have lower expectations and lower confidence in themselves and in the ability of the group (101).

Conger and Kanungo's Attribution Theory

"Charisma is an attributional phenomenon" (639). This is the argument put forth by Jay A. Conger and Rabindra N. Kanungo as their behavioral theory of charismatic leadership. They believe that, rather than a personality trait or a skill held by individual leaders, "charisma must be viewed as an attribution made by followers who observe certain behaviors on the part of the leader within organizational contexts" (639). Regardless of whether or not a leader actually has the traits or skills associated with charisma, if the followers perceive this to be the case, then he or she is a charismatic leader.

The authors argued that the attribution of charisma to individuals in leadership positions is dependent upon four variables. These variables are as follows:

> a) the degree of discrepancy between the status quo and the future goal or vision advocated by the leader, b) the use of innovative and unconventional means for achieving the desired change, c) a realistic assessment of environmental resources and constraints for bringing about such change, and d) the nature of articulation and impression management employed to inspire subordinates in the pursuit of the vision. (640)

The larger the discrepancy between the status quo, or the perceived status quo, and the vision as articulated by the leader, the more likely it is for followers to believe that leader to be charismatic (640). If the vision is vastly different from the current situation, then the leader will likely be perceived as extraordinary and able to transcend the mediocrity of the everyday world. The second factor in this attribution theory is the method by which the leader tries to initiate or implement change. Those leaders that seem willing to use extremely radical means, even to the point of personal risk or sacrifice, are often thought of as charismatic (642). These individuals convey the impression that they believe in the organization and its goals wholeheartedly, and are willing to risk personal loss for the gain of the group. A leader must also maintain an objective and realistic view of the outside world. He or she must never lose sight of the obstacles that the group must face, or of the resources that they have available to them (643). As will be discussed later, herein lies one of the dangers of charismatic leadership. Yet, the followers need to believe that the leader has a firm grasp on the current situation in order to attribute charisma to him or her. The final factor in the attribution theory, according to the authors, is the idea of impression management. What sort of image is the leader presenting to the followers? Most charismatic leaders portray themselves and the goals that they articulate as extremely positive forces of change or progress, and the obstacles that they face are inherently negative (643). The positivity and confidence that these leaders exude can be contagious, exciting and motivating the entire organization (643).

Conger and Kanungo present the idea that charismatic leadership is a phenomenon largely based on followers' perceptions. This elusive leadership style could even be thought of in the same way that Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart once described pornography: "I can't define it, but I know it when I see it" (Balmer xiii). In other words, though a follower may not be able to give a textbook definition of charismatic leadership, he or she can probably recognize this type of leadership and want to follow the leader in question. This idea is at the heart of the attribution theory. Followers observe certain behaviors from their leader, and they determine whether they want to follow that individual or not. If they believe the leader to be charismatic, they will most likely feel motivated to follow.

A Self-Concept Theory of Charismatic Leadership

Shamir, House, and Arthur's self-concept theory of charismatic leadership attempts to fill in a gap left by previous theories. According to Yukl, many of the earlier theories did not adequately address the reasons why or how charismatic leaders are able to influence and motivate

followers to place the needs of the organization above their own (324). The theory proposed by Shamir, House, and Arthur "links leader behavior and follower effects through follower self-concepts" (Shamir et al. 590). These theorists hold that charismatic leadership can be broken down into four main components: leader behaviors, effects on followers' self-concepts, further effects on followers, and the motivational processes used by the leader (581). The leader behaviors identified by this theory include many that have already been mentioned: the ability to articulate and communicate a strong vision, high expectations for followers, confidence, and self-sacrifice (Yukl 325).

The heart of the self-concept theory, according to the authors themselves, is the explanation of five motivational processes through which leaders can tap into and increase their followers' self-worth, thus enhancing the overall commitment to the vision and the group (Shamir et al. 581). These processes are as follows:

a) Increasing the intrinsic valence of effort
b) Increasing effort-accomplishment expectancies
c) Increasing the intrinsic valence of goal accomplishment
d) Instilling faith in a better future
e) Creating personal commitment (Shamir et al. 582-3)

Through these five techniques, a charismatic leader is able to inspire feelings of personal identification and social identification among the members of the group, as well as an internalization of the organization's values, and increased self-efficacy in followers (Yukl 326-7).

In simpler language, the goal of all of these processes is to increase follower commitment by making the vision and the organization itself integral parts of the follower's self-concept. The first process cites the importance of aligning the effort or work that needs to be done with the followers' value system. Followers need to believe that "by making the effort, one makes a moral statement" (582). Leaders can increase effort-accomplishment expectancies by establishing high expectations for the followers and then exhibiting confidence that they can meet these expectations. If the leader is perceived to have confidence in the followers, they are more likely to have confidence in themselves. This motivational process is effective because it enhances followers' self-esteem, self-worth, and thus self-efficacy (582). The third motivational technique involves the goal of the group. Leaders need to make the goal or vision meaningful to the followers, so they should be sure that the vision coincides with the values of the followers. If the members of the group feel that they are working towards a significant goal, one which agrees with or even embodies their values and beliefs, then they are more likely to be committed to the work (583). Charismatic leaders often speak of a dedication to a better future. Shamir and his colleagues see this practice as a key motivational process. By providing the followers with the promise of a utopian future in which they will receive the reward for all of their efforts, leaders are giving the followers a reason to subscribe to the group's agenda (583). The fifth and final motivational process identified in the self-concept theory of charismatic leadership is the leader's need to create a high level of personal commitment from the followers. By tapping into the followers' self-concepts

and aligning the goals of the group with each member's feelings of self-esteem and self-worth, the leader is able to create the sort of commitment level associated with charismatic leadership (583-4).

A Psychoanalytic Approach

From a psychoanalytic perspective, charismatic leadership occurs in response to the emotional needs of both the leader and the followers. One of the main theories from this perspective, the narcissistic explanation of charismatic leadership, focuses upon the idealization inherent in any situation involving a charismatic leader (Shamir 85). According to this theory, the internal conflict that will result in a longing for a charismatic leader begins to form in the very earliest stages of a child's development, the stage of "primary narcissism" (85). When a child is at this age, it believes itself to be the entire universe. As it gets a little older, however, the child realizes that he or she is not the whole universe, merely its center. The child's parents are perfect, omnipotent creatures that can anticipate and fulfill the child's every need. With age, he or she will grow more and more frustrated with the reality of the world, realizing that he (she) is not a perfect being at the center of the universe, nor are his parents. As reality sets in, the child will deal with these facts. However, an internal conflict has been created. For, while the child continues to develop in the real world, "there remains a lingering striving to recover the lost state of perfection," the time and beliefs associated with infancy (85). According to the narcissistic explanation of charismatic leadership, the child as adult may try to find and associate him/herself with a seemingly perfect, omnipotent leader, in an attempt to regain that "paradise lost" (85).

The human mind has developed psychological defense mechanisms in order to cope with the feelings of helplessness and insignificance resultant from the pain of this separation; two of them are idealization and projection. Narcissists searching for an omnipotent, protector-figure tend to idealize certain individuals, attributing them with all of the characteristics and behaviors that they believe their protector would have. Projection provides people with a way to maintain the belief that they are still perfect creatures. By projecting all negative feelings and attributes to some "other" group, narcissists can place blame and responsibility for anything unwanted or painful in the hands of someone else (Kets de Vries 594). Both of these behaviors, idealization and projection, provide an explanation for why followers might be drawn to and remain with a seemingly charismatic figure.

The narcissistic explanation of charismatic leadership also addresses the psychological disposition of the leader. Many of the characteristics of an extremely narcissistic personality could be applied to so-called charismatic leaders. According to Kets de Vries and Miller, "narcissism is often the driving force behind the desire to obtain a leadership position" (587). Symptoms of narcissism include grandiosity, exploitativeness, exhibitionism, self-reliance, high expectations, and a belief in their own entitlement, many of which have been cited as characteristics of charismatic leaders in leadership theory (588). Based on the work of Kets de Vries and Miller, it

would seem that a narcissistic leader and narcissistic followers would be a perfect match, and that together they could create a textbook-case charismatic leadership situation.

Charisma vs. Trust

In his recent work for the Kellogg Leadership Studies Project, Robert C. Solomon has proposed an interesting idea regarding the nature of charismatic leadership. Charisma, although an interesting notion, has only served as a distraction keeping leadership scholars away from the true heart of the matter, the "emotional core of leadership:" trust (19). He argues that leadership is essentially an emotional relationship built upon trust between leaders and followers (20). The idea of charisma is inadequate as an explanation for the complex set of emotions and feelings involved in any leadership situation. Instead, scholars should begin to explore the notion of trust as "an entire network of emotions and emotional attitudes, both between individuals and within groups" and as "the framework of expectations and agreements" in which action occurs (22, 23). For the purposes of this paper, Solomon's ideas may prove useful in analyzing the role that trust and faith have played in each of the four religious movements. Perhaps the role that trust based upon religious faith has played is just as important, if not more so, than the seemingly "charismatic" nature of each leader.

The "Dark Side" of Charismatic Leadership

Leadership scholars have learned an important lesson through the study of charisma: not all leadership is good leadership. This is the theme of Jay A. Conger's article, "The Dark Side of Leadership." Using examples from corporate America, he demonstrates ways in which charismatic leadership can prove to be detrimental for both the organization and the leader him/herself. Conger identifies three main reasons why a charismatic leadership situation can take a turn for the worse. These are: problems with the visionary leader, the impression-management strategies used by the leader, and the general management practices in the organization (44).

Although most leadership theories tout the benefits of a good vision and a leader that can articulate that vision, there are times when these components can be destructive to an organization. A strong vision needs to encompass the needs and desires of all of the members in an organization, not just the self-interests of those at the top. If a leader has used the vision as an instrument to further his or her own agenda, the organization could find itself in trouble (44). Members may either be manipulated by the puppet strings of a so-called charismatic leader and lose sight of their own interests, or they may realize what has occurred and leave the group in disillusionment. Another potential danger associated with visionary leaders is the risk that the leader may become so wrapped up in their lofty goals that they lose track of the real-world context in which they are working (44-45). Conger used the examples of executives that were so focused upon creating their dream products that they failed to notice the emerging competition or changes in the market that

would decrease the success of their product (44-47). A leader also runs the risk of becoming a "Pyrrhic victor," named after an ancient King of Epirus. Like the Pyrrhus of antiquity, a leader may end up losing more than he or she has gained through their efforts. Small victories do not outweigh large losses (47).

The communication or impression-managements practices of a charismatic leader may prove to be a liability. If a leader uses a carefully orchestrated public relations strategy, emphasizing his or her positive traits and minimizing the negative, the followers may never know who it is that they are actually following (50). A leader, or the spin doctors close to the top, may create an image that is then used to manipulate the will of the followers. This impression-management may also be used to distract the followers away from any problems within the organization, even to direct any suspicions or hostilities outside of the group (50).

An important concept to remember is that simply because someone is a charismatic leader, it doesn't necessarily mean that he or she is an effective manager of large groups of people. The unconventional behavior that is characteristic of this sort of leader may alienate members and potential converts. Often, there is the creation of an "in group/out group" structure that is destructive to the organization. Charismatic leaders often instill excessive feelings of dependence, through the self-concept or narcissistic ideas mentioned earlier, so that followers can no longer act on their own (52). All of these are potential dangers resultant from poor management practices. These three factors all have the potential to sour an otherwise effective charismatic leadership situation. Leadership scholars and practitioners alike need to keep these risks in mind as they address the topic of charisma and charismatic leadership.

The preceding theories, for the purposes of this paper, combine to form a conceptual framework for identifying the many different manifestations of charismatic leadership. At the end of each of the following case studies, this framework is used to analyze the leadership style of each leader in question. For each theory, the case is considered from two different perspectives: one in which the leader is viewed as sincere in his actions and beliefs, and the other in which he is not. If the perspective-dependent findings, based on each theory, differ, the distinction is detailed in the analysis section of the case. In addition, these theories form the basis for the conclusions regarding each man's individual leadership style.

David Koresh and the Branch Davidians

In order to understand the events that occurred at the Mount Carmel compound outside of Waco, Texas, it is necessary to study the Branch Davidian group from their very inception. The individuals that died in the conflagration were members of a long-standing tradition of prophets and religious apocalypticism, and it was this theological context that provided them with their perspective on the events that unfolded around them in the spring of 1993. This paper argues that it

was this apocalyptic worldview, as promoted by the charismatic figure of David Koresh, that enabled the cult members to remain committed to their group, even to the point of death.

The history of the Branch Davidians was rooted in Seventh-Day Adventism, an older and more established apocalyptic movement. This Christian denomination, in turn, originated out of the Millerite movement of the mid-nineteenth-century (Reid 311). In 1818, William Miller, a Baptist preacher in upstate New York, predicted that the Second Coming of Christ would occur sometime between March 21, 1843 and March 21, 1844 (Tabor 45, Reid 218). This time frame was based upon what Miller claimed had been a literal interpretation of the King James Bible, particularly of the prophecies found in the books of Daniel and Revelation (Tabor 44). His preachings and predictions managed to draw a somewhat large following, estimated at between 30,000 and 100,000 members. As the dates drew near, Miller's followers and skeptics alike began to look for some indication of the validity of his prediction. Beginning on February 27, 1843, a wondrous event occurred: a brilliant comet, visible even in the light of day, lit up the sky for several weeks. Taking this as one of the "signs of the heavens" that Jesus had spoken about in Luke 21:25 that would precede his coming, many more people began to pay attention to Miller and his predictions.

Yet, by March 21, 1844, Christ had not yet returned as Miller had prophesied. When the predicted event did not come to pass, Miller claimed that the chronology of the Bible must have been mistaken somehow, and continued to preach that the Second Coming was soon at hand (Reid 218). He reset the date at October 22, 1844 (Tabor 46). Again, when this date arrived, nothing happened. Undaunted, Miller still believed that the Return was soon at hand (Reid 218). However, many of his followers grew disillusioned and left his movement. Although their prophet had been proven false, many of the former Millerites were still firm believers in the imminent return of Christ. Some of these people formed their own apocalyptic movements (Reid 218). One of these groups formed what has become the Seventh-Day Adventist movement.

Perhaps the most significant result of the Millerite movement was that it clearly established the American apocalyptic worldview, which would eventually be inherited by the Branch Davidians. Along with the predictions of and preparations for the Second Coming, the Millerites were involved in the beginning stages of a battle between "true believers" and the American mainstream. As the movement's numbers grew, so did its opposition from the established religions and the media (Tabor 46). In response, the Millerites had found a place for America in their eschatology. Like many Christian splinter groups before and after them, the Millerites identified the hostile American establishment with ancient Babylon, citing the commands of voices from heaven in the Biblical text as proof that they need to remain in opposition with their oppressors (Tabor 46):

> He called out with a mighty voice, "Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great! It has become a dwelling place of demons, a haunt of every foul spirit, a haunt of every foul bird, a haunt of every foul and hateful beast. For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have grown rich from the power of her luxury." Then I heard another voice from heaven saying, "Come out of her, my people, so that you do not take part in her sins..." (Revelation 18: 2 - 4)

This association of the larger American society with Babylon provided the Millerites, and their theological descendants, with a scriptural validation for their separatism. Such an interpretation, one that makes America the antagonistic character in the apocalyptic drama described in Revelation, indicates the fact that the Millerites saw themselves as the "heroes" of the Apocalypse, the people that God has chosen to lead His kingdom in the new age. This self-identification is echoed in the theology of the Branch Davidians.

In 1845, shortly before his death, Miller published a work entitled *Apology and Defense*, in which he explained how his life fit in with the description of the end times found in Revelation. He claimed that he had fulfilled a portion of the ancient prophecies, as he played the role of the first of the angels mentioned in Revelation 14 that announced the coming of the kingdom of God (Tabor 47). In the text, this angel "said in a loud voice, "Fear God and give him glory, for the hour of his judgment has come" (Revelation 14: 7). Millerite theology, and later that of the Adventists and the Davidians, was based upon the belief that there would be an actual sequence of events that followed the prophecies laid out in Revelation, including the appearance of these angelic messengers (Tabor 47). This is a notion that was embraced by David Koresh, and it will appear again in the history of the Branch Davidians.

The Seventh-Day Adventist movement emerged out of the wake of the "Great Disappointment," which is what Miller's false prophecy was called (Tabor 47). Miller's followers had already taken the name "Adventists," as they believed in the coming of the Lord. This particular group of Adventists, that chooses to observe a seventh-day (Saturday) sabbath in accordance to their interpretation of the Ten Commandments, was born in Washington, New Hampshire (Reid 311, Tabor 47). The leaders of this group, including a prominent woman named Ellen G. White, believed that Miller had been only half-correct in his predictions. They claimed that the date he had given was the time at which Jesus would enter "the inner room of the heavenly Temple... in preparation for his final work of judgment" (Tabor 48). The Second Coming, Christ's visible return to earth, would be at some later date.

Like Miller, this group placed itself in the prophecies of Revelation. The leaders of the early Seventh-Day Adventists saw themselves as fulfilling the role of the third angelic messenger, whose duty it was to prepare the world for Christ's return. They believed they could carry out this task by spreading the news of the impending judgment, of sharing the angels' messages with the world (Tabor 48).

As they searched for the fulfillment of ancient prophecies, these early leaders, especially Ellen G. White, continued Miller's tradition of making their own predictions for the future. White claimed to have experience over two thousand visions in her lifetime, and this ability led to her extremely influential role in the history and theology of the Seventh-Day Adventist movement (Reid 362). She placed a strong emphasis on the "Spirit of prophecy," a notion that became a central belief for Adventists. White predicted a continual, dynamic revelation of truth in the time to come, a prophecy of "new light" that will unfold as the end time draws near (Tabor 48 - 49). Koresh later expounded upon White's life and prophecies, which will be explained in the section

regarding Branch Davidian theology. Under the prophecy and leadership of Ellen White, along with her colleagues, the Adventists continued to grow, eventually developing into a large, established religion with members around the world.

The Branch Davidians are a splinter group that broke away from the larger Seventh-Day Adventist movement due to a conflict with the larger group over the interpretation of the events of the Apocalypse. In 1918, a young Bulgarian man named Victor Houteff joined a Seventh-Day Adventist congregation in Los Angeles. He devoted much of his time to an intense study of the Bible, and eventually developed two main theories regarding the role of the Adventists in the Apocalypse.

Both of Houteff's theories were based upon his interpretation of the book of Revelation. His first idea was concerned with the 144,000 "servants of our God," as described in Revelation 7. According to the text, the angels of the Lord will mark the heads (or "seal") of 144,000 chosen people, twelve thousand from each of the original twelve tribes of Israel (Revelation 7: 3 - 8). These people will be the ones that survive the Lord's final judgment and will be the leaders of the new kingdom of God. The traditional Adventist view, as promoted by Ellen White, was that this number described the Seventh-Day Adventists themselves. However, Houteff believed that the Adventists had become corrupt, succumbing to worldly influences and losing sight of their divine purpose. In light of this view, he believed that it was up to him to gather together the purist of the Adventists, and that they were all to cleanse the church from within. Believing himself to be one of the Lord's angels, he thought that he would build the group of 144,000 described in the text, and they would all travel to Jerusalem to await the Second Coming (Tabor 34).

Houteff's second teaching was in direct conflict with Seventh-Day Adventist theology. While the latter group subscribed to the belief that the Lord's Second Coming was to be a spiritual event, in which the souls of the righteous would be taken up into heaven to live with Christ for the millennium, Houteff argued that the literal events described in the text would occur. He believed that there really would be a physical battle between the forces of good and evil, and that the Kingdom of God would be an actual, physical kingdom centered in Palestine. Houteff preached the idea that the select 144,000, led by himself, must travel to Palestine, the land of the ancient Hebrew prophets, in order to await the coming of the Lord (Tabor 35).

The combination of these two controversial teachings proved to be too much for the Seventh-Day Adventist community to bear. When Houteff began to preach these ideas in a public forum, the elders branded him a heretic and banned him from teaching under their auspices. Still eager to get his message out, Houteff began to publish his thoughts in his own periodical, *The Shepherd's Rod* (Tabor 35). In 1934, the Seventh-Day Adventists officially expelled him from the church. He began calling himself a Davidian Seventh-Day Adventist, adding the "Davidian" as an indication of the group's belief in "the imminent restoration of the "Davidic" messianic kingdom in Palestine" (Tabor 35). Houteff eventually relocated, drawing many of his followers with him, and in 1935 established a community outside of Waco, Texas. Until his death in 1955, the group in Texas was known as The Shepherd's Rod (Rifkind 66).

Following Houteff's death, several factions fought for control of the group. Florence Houteff, the late leader's widow, held the leadership role for the next several years, yet her authority was often challenged. The group seemed to lose its direction for a while, as the man that they had expected to lead them through the Apocalypse was gone (Tabor 38). The original Waco property was sold, and the group moved to a nearby site, hailed as the New Mount Carmel, which remained the Davidians' primary location until it was destroyed in 1993 (Tabor 38).

Like many of her Millerite and Adventist predecessors, Florence Houteff believed that the time of the Second Coming was drawing near. Soon after taking over the leadership of the Davidian group, she revealed her belief that the events of the Apocalypse would begin during the Passover season of 1959 (Tabor 38). She believed that these events would include the destruction of the wicked Seventh-Day Adventists as the Lord established his Kingdom for the true believers (Rifkind 66). Some members of the group believed that their former leader, Victor Houteff, would be resurrected and fulfill his role of shepherd, guiding them into the new age (Rifkind 66, Tabor 38). Approximately nine hundred people gathered at the Davidian compound in anticipation of these events, yet they only found disappointment. After Florence Houteff's predictions were proven to be false, she left the group and a power struggle ensued. The leadership role was eventually claimed by a couple from Texas, Ben and Lois Roden (Tabor 39).

While Benjamin Roden was in charge, the group continued to grow. He changed the name of the group to the Branch Davidians, based on a revelation that he claimed to have had. Through this revelation, he was made aware of the fact that he was the "branch" described by the prophet Zechariah, a servant of the Lord (Zechariah 3: 8, Tabor 39). He also bestowed this title of "branch" on all of the members of the group, in accordance with John 15: 1 - 3, which describes the followers of Jesus as the branches of the true vine. During this period, the 1960s through Roden's death in 1978, the Davidians continued their extensive recruitment efforts in an attempt to gather the 144,000. They published and distributed pamphlets around the world, and remained dedicated to the goal of purifying the corrupt Seventh-Day Adventists (Tabor 40).

Following her husband's death, Lois Roden became the leader of the Branch Davidians. Under her authority, the group became much more organized. They adopted a constitution with a series of by-laws that clearly dictated the structure of the group: the leader, believed to be the living prophet, had absolute power over the group (Rifkind 66). Perhaps the most significant feature of Lois Roden's "rule" as the prophetess of the Davidians was her conceptualization of God. She believed that the feminine aspect of the divine had been neglected for far too long, and that it was time for the group to recognize the feminine nature of God (Rifkind 67, Tabor 40). Roden claimed that this realization was the "new light" that Ellen White had predicted nearly a century before (Tabor 40).

Roden's theology caused a great deal of controversy within the group, and one of the greatest challenges to her authority came from her own son. The prophetess often left the Mount Carmel compound, traveling in order to spread the truths that she had received. During her absences from the community, George Roden tried to convince the members of the group that he,

when he gave his Bible studies, "He could have been a professional entertainer, the best this world has ever seen. He could entertain" (Tabor 31).

Howell argued that he alone could reveal the truths of the Bible. As the Lord's living prophet, he had a special ability and authority to explain the hidden meanings of the text, as described in the book of Amos: "Surely the Lord God does nothing, without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets" (Amos 3: 7, Tabor 28). After his trip to Israel in 1985, Howell began preaching that he had been given the full knowledge of the Scriptures, a knowledge that no one else had (Tabor 59).

After his "revelation," Howell began preaching what he called the "Cyrus message" (Tabor 59). Cyrus is an exceptionally important figure in Hebrew history. He was the king of Persia during the time of the Hebrews' Babylonian Exile, supposedly appointed by God to lead His chosen people to freedom. In 539 bce, Cyrus conquered Babylon and liberated the people of Israel. Tradition claims that Cyrus was a messiah for his time, messiah meaning "anointed one," chosen to carry out the will of God on earth (Tabor 59). King Cyrus is actually mentioned in the book of Isaiah: "Thus says the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus..." (Isaiah 45: 1).

Vernon Howell believed himself to be a modern-day Cyrus, once again liberating God's chosen people from the oppressive rule of Babylon (Tabor 60). He claimed that through his revelation in Israel, in which he heard the voice of God Himself, he learned of his own role in the events of the end time (Tabor 61). Howell saw himself as the messiah-figure that had been chosen to do the work of the Lord in this time. Reminding his people of the power of his authority because of this divine selection, he taught that if "you reject Cyrus, you reject God" (Tabor 32).

Many of his critics in the mainstream society challenged him for believing that he was Jesus Christ, yet there is an important theological distinction to be made in order to understand Howell's beliefs as to who or what he was. The most common conceptualization of the divine in Christianity is the Trinitarian view, that of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. However, this view did not emerge among Christians until several years, even centuries, after Jesus' death. Another view, commonly held by the Ebionites (early Christians) in the first century, was that of "Adoptionism." According to this view, Jesus was an ordinary human being that was born and died as only a man. However, during the course of his lifetime, he was "adopted" by God, chosen to fulfill a special mission on earth. It was this "adoption" or "anointing" that made Jesus a messiah figure for the Jews that chose to follow him (Tabor 56, Eakin). So, from an "Adoptionist" perspective, it was possible for an ordinary human to be chosen as a "divine" servant of the Lord.

Howell believed that, like Jesus and Cyrus before him, he had been "adopted" by God to carry out the divine plan on earth. He perceived himself to be the seventh and final messenger angel described in Revelation, the one that will open up the Seven Seals and usher in the events of the end times (Tabor 53 - 57, Kantrowitz 57). He also associated himself with the "destroying angel" in Ezekiel that would seal, or mark, the foreheads of the righteous and destroy those who were not true believers (Niebuhr A6).

Weaving together several different biblical texts, from both the Old and the New

(83). Regardless of Breault's personal motivation, however, the government took his claims seriously.

On February 28, 1993, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms staged a raid on the Mount Carmel compound. Early on that Sunday morning, a gun battle between the federal agents and members of the Davidian community erupted, leaving four ATF agents dead and sixteen more injured, with at least ten casualties from within the compound (Biskupic A1, Rifkind 65). Later that evening, a second gunfight broke out, resulting in more deaths within the compound (Biskupic A1).

On that morning, Koresh called 911 and spoke to Lieutenant Larry Lynch of the Waco police department. In that conversation, Koresh reported that some of his children had been killed in the gunfire, which he claimed was started by the ATF. While Lynch attempted to get some information from Koresh regarding casualties, trying to start some negotiation, the cult leader began speaking about theology, asserting the fact that the Davidians would continue to "serve God first" (Tabor 99). Lynch repeatedly tried to bring Koresh back to a conversation about the events that were occurring, but the leader kept returning to his interpretation of the events as part of God's plan (Tabor 97- 99). This early incident of miscommunication between Koresh and the law enforcement agents was just one of many. As the standoff between the Davidians and the ATF, and later the FBI, continued, the agents grew increasingly frustrated with Koresh's "Bible babble," and often discounted the message that he was trying to convey to them through his Scripture-laden speech (Tabor 108). Because of this miscommunication, the federal agents did not ever truly grasp the Branch Davidians' apocalyptic view of the situation.

After the initial ATF raid on the compound, the FBI was called in to deal with the situation. Officially terming the scene a hostage rescue scenario, the federal agents originally intended to set up negotiations with Koresh, convincing him to release his "hostages" (Tabor 104 - 105). After this plan proved unsuccessful, they began a "stress escalation" strategy that involved cutting off the compound's electricity, blasting loud music and noises through giant speakers, shining heavy floodlights on the buildings, and flying helicopters over the site continuously (Tabor 107). Attempts at communication with Koresh were made throughout the 51-day siege, yet the federal agents grew impatient with the "Bible babble" and continued to view the cult leader as a hostile opponent (108).

On April 19, 1993, the siege came to an end. Federal agents had received permission from Attorney General Janet Reno (whose role in this drama, even though she eventually claimed responsibility, is debatable) to proceed with a strike on the compound. At approximately 6 a.m., two tanks began to puncture the walls of the compound, inserting tear gas. The agents believed that this effort would finally bring the Davidians out of the compound. Roughly six hours later, someone on the outside began to see smoke pouring out of a window on the inside. Not long after, the entire compound had been destroyed by a great conflagration. Only a handful of Branch Davidians survived the fire; estimates of casualties range from 80 to 130, including David Koresh (Tabor 2 - 3, 23, Rifkind 65).

Though there have been many criticisms regarding the actions of the government during both the raid and the siege, some claim that their biggest mistake was that they failed to take the Davidians' religious beliefs seriously. According to both Marc Breault and experts in the field of religious scholarship, the government seriously neglected the religious context from within which Koresh was operating. When the ATF, and later the FBI, considered the Mount Carmel situation, they very rarely concerned themselves the Davidians' apocalyptic viewpoint on the events that they were effecting. Marc Breault made the following statement after the tragedy had occurred:

> ...I strongly advised the ATF that if they were going to arrest Vernon, they do so with no force, that they somehow lure Vernon away from Carmel...We repeatedly advised the ATF to use this tactic... I am outraged that government mishandling, along with Vernon's own delusions of grandeur, contributed to the deaths of all those children I knew and loved, not to mention the adults... The FBI mishandled a lot of things during the siege. They did not take sufficient not of Vernon's religion and its teaching. They assumed they were the experts... (Tabor 87)

This sentiment regarding the government's mishandling of the situation is echoed in Tabor and Gallagher's book, *Why Waco?* These two religion professors argue that the entire situation could have been resolved very differently, if only the government agents had considered the group's religious beliefs before they declared it all a "complex Hostage/Barricade rescue situation" (Tabor 4).

The religious beliefs in question, the apocalyptic eschatology promoted by David Koresh, provide an answer to a question that had the agents puzzled for months: Why wouldn't the Davidians come out of the compound during the siege? Whether they realized it or not, the actions of the ATF and of the FBI during the spring of 1993 perfectly matched the events of Revelation, as interpreted by David Koresh. Like in the final, prophetic book of the Bible, the agents of an oppressive government, of "Babylon," had attacked and killed members of God's chosen people and wounded their prophet (Tabor 4).

Analysis

Perhaps one of the most astounding elements of the Branch Davidians' story, at least for outsiders, was their willingness to remain inside the compound even in the face of what amounted to a military attack. Yet, when considering the history and context of the situation from the perspective of the group members, this fact is no longer quite so amazing. Throughout the siege, David Koresh preached that the end time had arrived, that the events of Revelation were unfolding around them. At this point, the believers among the Davidians had such a strong faith in their leader, a man that they believed to be a messenger of God, that they probably saw no reason to disagree with his interpretation of the situation. How had Koresh, in his ten years of authority at Mount Carmel, managed to inspire such strong commitment and devotion from his followers? An analysis of the Waco situation using a framework of leadership theory can provide an answer to this question: Koresh was a charismatic leader that used his theology to inspire extreme levels of

commitment from his followers.

Koresh matches the general description of a charismatic leader, one who "envisions," "energizes," and "enables," in many ways (Nadler and Tushman 109). The common vision that he articulated was certainly appealing: a glorified future in the kingdom of God, with special places reserved for his followers. The strength of Koresh's rhetorical skills rested in his ability to expound upon the Bible. There seems to be no question about the fact that Koresh was an entertainer, be it in his rock band or in his Bible study sessions. He showed a great deal of confidence in his followers through his continuous preaching that the group, under his leadership, would be the ones to usher in the new age of the Lord. He was also a very personal leader, especially in his teachings. Koresh was always willing to spend time with his followers, sharing with them his special instruction in the biblical text. According to Tabor and Gallagher, "No person was unimportant to him since he viewed anyone who showed interest as among those that God was choosing for a special mission" (25).

House and Howell's theory of personality and charismatic leadership focuses upon the traits of an individual leader. Due to the nature of this case, and of this study, the only conclusions that can be drawn regarding the application of this theory are based on educated speculation. In terms of this theory, the case of David Koresh could be argued from two different perspectives: the first as if Koresh was sincere in his teachings and beliefs, and the second as if he was not. If Koresh really did believe, for whatever reason, that he was an angelic messenger carrying out the will of God, then his individual personality would probably not have had much of a conscious effect on the situation. Instead, he would most likely have believed himself to be an instrument of the divine will, and that his rise to power was not the result of his individual choices.

During the 1993 siege, the FBI asked two psychiatrists to construct psychological profiles of Vernon Howell/David Koresh. The first of these profiles, completed by Dr. Park Dietz of UCLA, concluded that Koresh was a psychopath with "antisocial and narcissistic personality traits that enabled him to become a master of manipulation" (Tabor 105 - 106). It is important to note that this profile was constructed based upon secondhand information only; Dietz never actually met with Koresh or any of the Davidians (106). A later profile, written by Dr. Di Giovanni, reported no evidence of delusion on the part of Koresh, and claimed that he was a very logical, "normal" person firmly rooted in his religious faith (106 - 107). This profile was the result of Giovanni's personal investigation of Koresh and his group, including a visit to the Waco compound during the siege (106).

If the opinions of Dr. Park Dietz and the general public were correct, and Koresh was "faking" his religious claims, then the cult leader would fit into the personality framework detailed by House and Howell. From this perspective, David Koresh seems to fit the general description of a "personalized leader," a very dominant and authoritarian figure focused upon his own self-interests, often at the expense of his followers (House and Howell 84). One could speculate that Koresh had a strong need for power, which possibly developed while he was an adolescent

searching for his own niche. Early on, he was expelled from the Seventh-Day Adventist church because he tried to assert himself as a new leader for the congregation. Once he arrived at Mount Carmel, the young Vernon Howell quickly associated himself with the leader of the group, Lois Roden, and began to build his own loyal following through his biblical teachings. Perhaps he intended to claim the leadership of the group from the very beginning. These examples indicate Howell/Koresh's tendency to proclaim himself as the leader of a group, even in the early stages of his own membership. In their study, House and Howell show that personalized leaders with a strong need for power would rather be rebellious than cooperative, which is a description that could certainly be applied to an insincere Koresh.

The Machiavellian and narcissistic components of this theory are also applicable to the case of Koresh as a false prophet. Koresh's controversial "New Light" revelation could be used as extreme evidence for a Machiavellian nature if Koresh established those particular rules because of his own personal agenda or desires, and not because it was the will of God. Through this tactic, he forced his followers to make huge sacrifices in their personal and emotional lives, while he continued to reap the benefits of any intimate relationship that he desired. Thus, he could have been putting his own wishes ahead of the needs of his followers. If Koresh was insincere in his teachings, then he could be cited as an extreme example of a narcissistic charismatic leader. House and Howell describe this type of leader as one with an exaggerated conception of or a preoccupation with the self. Howell/Koresh's self-identification as the new Messiah, an angelic messenger with absolute authority sent from the Lord, fits this description.

The final two elements of the personality theory of charismatic leadership, authoritarianism and self-efficacy, are less applicable to the characterization of Koresh as a fraudulent leader. Authoritarian leaders, according to this framework, tend to work from within the established society. Koresh, however, taught that the American establishment was the modern reincarnation of an ancient enemy, Babylon. Although he did not preach active hostility towards mainstream society, he was apparently content with his group's position at the very fringes of American culture. It is difficult to say how the final element of this theory, self-efficacy, applies to Koresh. The two components of this characteristic are the leader's self-esteem and locus of control. Like the typical personalized leader, Koresh claimed an external locus of control, namely, God. However, there is no way to measure the late cult leader's self-esteem, other than to speculate that it was probably either extremely high or extremely low. Regardless of the difficulties with these two elements of the theory, Koresh does seem to fit the model of a personalized charismatic leader, as described by House and Howell.

The attributional theory of charismatic leadership, presented by Conger and Kanungo, is applicable to Koresh whether he believed in his own teachings or not. For, in this theory, it is more important to consider what the followers think, not the leader. In the framework of this theory, there are four main variables that combine to form the picture of a charismatic leader. Each of these variables appear in the case study of David Koresh. The first is in regards to the degree of

difference between the group's current situation or context and the envisioned future. For the Branch Davidians, these difference was tremendous. They all lived in the hopes that, some day soon, the corrupt world around them would be replaced by the glorious Kingdom of God, and with it would begin a state of grace unlike anything they had ever experienced before. Because of this large discrepancy between the realized and the anticipated situation, Koresh's display of confidence and assurance that he would be the one to usher them into this new age enabled the followers to view him as an extraordinary or superhuman figure, which is a hallmark of attributed charisma.

The second variable is the leader's use of unconventional means to achieve his vision. In Koresh's case, the entire nature of the Mount Carmel community could be considered unconventional. This was a small, isolated and self-sufficient group living in a heavily armed compound outside of a small town in Texas. The leader, who claimed to be the new Messiah, had divided the community by gender lines, and broke social norms even further by taking several women, some as young as 13 or 14, as his wives. The Branch Davidians, or at least some of them, must have realized that this sort of community was not quite average. Their recognition of Koresh's unusual methods, according to this theory, would add to their perception of him as a charismatic leader.

The members of the Mount Carmel community, according to the findings of this case study, believed that Koresh was the only one that truly grasped the context in which they were living. He was their prophet, the only person that could explain to them the significance of history, both past and present, in light of the biblical text. Koresh's instruction regarding the role of the community, versus the role of the federal agents, in the events predicted in Revelation provided the group members with their worldview and confirmed for them their mission to remain in the compound awaiting a divine command.

The fourth variable of this theory calls for an investigation of Koresh's impression management techniques. By associating himself, the group, and their opponents with the characters of the apocalyptic drama, Koresh clearly defined for the group who were the "good guys" and who were not. Anyone that opposed him and his mission, which was also the mission of the group, was their antagonist in the final battle for the Kingdom of God. Meanwhile, he portrayed himself as a force of ultimate good, an angel sent by the lord to save the members of the group. Associations such as these provided the group with very little choice regarding to whom they should pledge their loyalties, and they added to the Davidians' perceptions of Koresh as an extraordinary figure.

Through Koresh's teachings, the Branch Davidians were able to form extremely strong bonds of personal and social identification to the group and its mission. According to the House, Shamir and Arthur self-concept theory, this indicates that Koresh was, indeed, a charismatic leader. This theory delineates five main motivational processes common to charismatic leaders, all of which Koresh utilized at one time or another. Three of these processes directly relate to the

apocalyptic theology espoused by Koresh. The first process involves aligning the goals of the group with the followers' personal values systems, another is concerned with the meaningfulness of the vision, and yet another calls for the promise of a better future. As the overall goal of the group was salvation, Koresh did not have that much work to do in these areas. Most of his followers were Seventh-Day Adventists to begin with, and they were already anticipating the imminent return of Christ that would inaugurate the new age on earth. As most had already begun living their lives in preparation for this event, Koresh simply needed to demonstrate how his particular vision was the closest to their needs and beliefs. Usually, he accomplished this by explaining who he was, in biblical terms, and by giving people a taste of his interpretation of the Scriptures.

The remaining two motivational processes involve the empowerment and the commitment of the followers. In the Branch Davidian case, these are connected. Koresh displayed a high level of confidence in his followers, teaching them that they were the people chosen by God to begin the new age described in Revelation. By associated his followers with a group described in the Bible and giving them a role in the divine plan, Koresh added the notion of being among the chosen few to the self-concepts of his followers. This boost (or manipulation) of the group members' self-concept resulted in an extremely high level of commitment from the Davidians, even while their community was threatened by the outside forces of the American government.

In this case study, the psychoanalytic (or narcissistic) approach to charismatic leadership is applicable to the group's perceptions of both Koresh and their enemies. The group believed that Koresh was their living prophet, a messiah figure sent to save them according to God's plan. The American establishment, on the other hand, was thought to be a new Babylon, an oppressive government attacking God's chosen people. These perceptions were likely the result of two psychological processes associated with narcissism, idealization and projection. Narcissists, in this case the Davidians, tend to search for an omnipotent protector-figure that will provide for their every need. This particular group found this figure in the idealized character of David Koresh. Their perceptions of the government, on the other hand, were probably based on a projection of all of their fears and hostilities on an outside entity, a behavior that enables a group to maintain the belief that they are perfect and infallible. From a narcissistic perspective, Koresh was a charismatic leader based upon the idealized perceptions, or attributions, of his followers.

Robert Solomon has argued that trust, not charisma, is the essence of the good leader-follower relationship. This theory does coincide with the events of the Branch Davidian case. The members of the Mount Carmel community placed a great deal of trust in David Koresh, probably because of who they believed him to be. As an angel of the Lord, he would be deserving of all of their trust or admiration. Regardless of his self-identification, he was also a gifted teacher known for illuminating the text in ways that his followers had never seen before. Perhaps they trusted him for this ability, as well. Some would argue that the relationship between Koresh and his followers

was not based on trust, but on intimidation or brainwashing (Rifkind). However, in light of the theology presented in this case study, it is likely that the relationships among the Davidians and their David were based on trust, which was in turn based on their apocalyptic religion.

Jay Conger's warnings of the "dark side" of charismatic leadership, which are especially applicable to this tragic case, are based on three potential problems. The first potential risk is that a visionary leader will either misuse or lose sight of the group's vision. In hindsight, this could be cited as one of the reasons why the Branch Davidians' story ended in tragedy. If Koresh was a fraud, then it could be argued that he manipulated the vision and values of the group in order to further his own agenda and fulfill his own desires. If the cult leader was sincere, then perhaps he became too focused on the sequence of events yet to come that he lost sight of the events of the present, and was thus unprepared to handle any sort of inquiry or challenge from the outside world.

The remaining two dangers described by Conger have to deal with a leader's management of the perceptions and practices within a group. The first risk is that a leader can deceive his or her followers through the extensive use of impression management techniques, and never present the followers with a true picture of the person at the helm. It is extremely likely that this occurred at Waco, at least to some degree. The cult leader presented an all-powerful persona to his followers, constantly reminding them that he was more than just an ordinary human. As seen in the events surrounding the departure of George Roden and Marc Breault from the group, Koresh did not take kindly to challenges to his authority. The final risk presented by Conger is that a charismatic leader has a tendency to inspire both strong commitment and strong opposition due to his or her unconventional means of pursuing the group's goal. Again, this can be seen in the case of Marc Breault. Once Koresh's right-hand man, the former cult member became the most outspoken opponent of Koresh. It was his efforts that eventually drew the attention of the authorities to the small group outside of Waco, setting into motion the series of events that ended with the great conflagration.

The question that this paper poses regarding the role of charismatic leadership in the Branch Davidian movement is as follows:

> *How did David Koresh's leadership style impact the tragic events that occurred at the Branch Davidians' Mount Carmel compound in the spring of 1993?*

This study presents the argument that it was Koresh's charismatic leadership style, rooted in his apocalyptic theology, that inspired such a level of commitment in his followers that they remained with him, inside the compound, until their deaths. Koresh taught his followers that he was a Messiah for the twentieth century, picked by God to cleanse the Seventh-Day Adventist church and draw together the 144,000 pure, chosen people of God so that they could all await the coming of the Lord as prophesied in the Bible. By aligning the goals of the group, and possibly his personal agenda, with the values and beliefs of the followers, he made his vision an integral portion of each

believer's self-concept. His dynamic presence, unconventional attitudes towards social norms, and exceptional knowledge of the Scriptures inspired trust, faith, and commitment in his followers. Many of these followers chose to remain with their prophet, living and dying in a sequence of events that they believed had been predicted thousands of years before.

Jerry Falwell and the Religious Right in America

In contrast to the stigmatized Branch Davidians, Jerry Falwell and his Fundamentalist congregation are members of a religious group that has been steadily increasing its presence and influence in the American mainstream: the Religious Right. The recent history of this group and its growing involvement in politics and culture, as exemplified by the case of Reverend Falwell's ministries, are somewhat anomalistic when considered in light of their separatist theology. How have the leaders of this movement been able to reconcile this theology with their political call-to-arms? The following case examines the efforts of one of these leaders, Reverend Jerry Falwell. Using the established framework of charismatic leadership, this study argues that Falwell's charismatic leadership style is one of the key factors in the rise of the Religious Right.

In order to understand the current situation of Fundamentalists in the Religious Right, it is necessary to trace the movement back to where it all began. Fundamentalism is a subgroup of a larger Protestant movement in America, known as evangelicalism. Evangelicals, also known as "born-again" Christians, can trace the history of their movement through the early years of the United States (Reid 123). In the first few decades of the eighteenth century, many of the colonies were marked by growing religious divisions between members of the Puritan church and nonmembers that were losing interest in the Church's control over civic affairs (Martin 2). In the 1730s, however, a widespread religious revival began to take place in America. Known as the Great Awakening, this revival is the event that earned Jonathan Edwards his place in history books, and was the first instance of "popular evangelicalism" in America (Reid 148). The religious fervor inspired by this series of revivals continued to carry the colonies until the time of the American Revolution.

Although some credit the evangelical atmosphere of the early nation with many of the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the movement lost some of its zeal in the years after the Revolution. A number of early commentators thought that religion was on the wane in America, and Thomas Paine even predicted that "Christianity will be forgotten in thirty years" (Martin 3). These prophecies were proven wrong, however, with the occurrence of the Second Great Awakening, also known as the Great Revival. In contrast to the First Great Awakening, which was mainly a northeastern phenomenon, this series of revivals took place in two phases

encompassing two different regions of the young country. The first phase took place in the wild American frontier, and it was characterized by huge camp meetings and tent revivals. Some of these meetings could last a week long, and number their participants in the thousands (Reid 308-309). As the revivals passed through towns, many new churches were created in order to sustain the renewed interest in religion. This phase of the Second Awakening nearly succeeded in "achieving the evangelical dream of making America a Christian nation," as it "turned the American South into perhaps the most distinctively and self-consciously religious region in Christendom" (Martin 4). Evangelicalism in the young South included the typical "born-again" beliefs in the divine inspiration and complete inerrancy of the Bible, the need for piety, and the mission to win over new believers, to save "lost souls" (Martin 4).

In addition to the typical revivalist notions of the Second Coming and preparation for the millennium, the New England phase of the Second Awakening included a growing emphasis on the moral lives of American evangelicals (Martin 4). The idea of "perfectionism," that Christians should lead perfect, sinless lives, began to take hold. Many evangelicals took a stand against such 'sins' as "alcohol, gambling, fornication, profanity, and dishonesty" (Martin 4). Although the tendency was for people to focus on their own, individual piety, some evangelicals took it upon themselves to become active opponents of immorality. Under the leadership of such individuals as Charles Finney, a revivalist that did most of his preaching in upstate New York, many churchgoers became involved in the temperance and abolitionist movements, as well as in missionary work (Reid 309). Finney even preached that he and his followers were "bound to exert their influence to secure a legislation that is in accordance with the law of God" (Martin 5). Thus, early on in our nation's history, evangelical Christians were advocates of social reform as it corresponded with their religious beliefs. As a result of this period of revivals, evangelicalism was the most common religion in antebellum America (Reid 123).

In the period following the Civil War, several factors led to a period of decline for evangelical Americans. There were disagreements between the main evangelical denominations regarding the idea of slavery, and these internal conflicts only added to the threats that evangelicals felt from outside (Martin 5). This period of American history was a time of modernization, marked by the increase of immigration, urbanization, and industrialization. These three trends constituted a triple threat to the continued success of evangelical Christianity (Martin 6, Reid 123-124). The comfortable homogeneity that the evangelicals enjoyed was no longer, as millions of immigrants, Catholics, Jews, and others, came to America searching for freedom (Martin 6). With the trends towards urbanization and industrialization, many Americans left the traditional rural, agrarian lifestyle in pursuit of work in the growing cities. As evangelicalism, especially in the South, tended to be a rather rural phenomenon, many church leaders were afraid that this sort of migration would lead to godlessness and debauchery once their followers left the safety of their farms (Marsden 185).

During this period of modernization, a conflict grew within the ranks of evangelical Christians. Lines were drawn between those that wanted to adapt their theology to the new ideals

of modernism and those that believed they needed to stay focused upon the fundamental tenets of their faith. The modernists, as they were called, thought that the only way that Christianity could continue to be successful would be through a more liberal, updated interpretation of its theology that would allow its members to accept the rapid changes that had occurred in American society (Reid 192). Rather than preaching the traditional evangelical doctrine, which stated that a person could only achieve salvation through the grace of God and not through any sort of individual effort, modernists began to advocate the idea of the Social Gospel. They embraced social reform as the means through which they could guide America through her changes, helping her remain a Christian nation (Reid 192-193).

These modernists also promoted liberal interpretations of the biblical text, trying to reconcile its words with many of the new discoveries in the field of science and the new scholarly pursuit of biblical criticism (Martin 6). Topics treated by this new, liberal interpretation included many of the famous stories of Genesis, such as the seven days of Creation and the Great Flood, as well as the New Testament ideas of the Second Coming of Christ. Whereas traditional evangelical doctrine holds that every event or prophecy in the Bible should be interpreted literally, word for word, modernists began viewing the text critically, looking for symbolism and metaphors that would reconcile the Scripture with scientific and historical facts (James). The development of this liberal theology sparked the fundamentalist-modernist debate of the early twentieth century, a debate that resulted in a break in the evangelical movement.

The Foundations of Fundamentalism

As the modernists were developing their new theology and participating in social reform, traditional evangelicals began a new campaign to spread support for their view of Christianity. They continued to advocate the ideas of biblical inerrancy, moral perfectionism, and salvation through divine grace versus individual effort, and, with renewed fervor, these evangelicals began preaching this doctrine throughout the country again. This "anti-modernist revival" was led by two main preachers: Dwight L. Moody in the years after the Civil War, and Billy Sunday in the post-World War I era (Martin 6). Both of these men are key figures in the history of American fundamentalism.

Dwight Moody was an extremely successful urban revivalist whose legacy can be seen in the continuing achievement of Chicago's Moody Bible Institute, a bastion of fundamentalist theology. In the last few decades of the nineteenth century, Moody embarked upon several revival tours of both the United States and Great Britain, spreading the ideals of traditionalist evangelicalism (Reid 226). Theologically, Moody was one of the first to advocate a new form of biblical interpretation known as dispensationalist premillennialism (Martin 7). This perspective combines two distinct theological concepts, dispensationalism and premillennialism.

Dispensationalism, devised by a British biblical scholar named John Nelson Darby in the 1830s, presents the belief that human history is divided into seven periods, or "dispensations"

(Balmer 32). Each period began with a covenant between God and mankind, and each covenant came with a human obligation to carry out a certain task, or meet a certain challenge, as put to them by God (Balmer 32). The previous dispensations, which Darby delineated according to a strict, literal interpretation of the Bible's telling of history, have all ended when humans failed to meet their end of the bargain. God responded with a judgment and punishment, and then the cycle began again. One example of a dispensation is "the Age of Promise," the time of the Patriarchs, which began when Abraham made his original covenant with God. When Abraham's descendants failed to remain true to God's will, He punished them by placing them in captivity in Egypt. This was the fourth dispensation, according to Darby's scheme (James). Currently, if one follows the dispensationalist paradigm of history, we are in the midst of the sixth dispensation, "the Age of Grace." This age began at the time of the Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended to the earth, according to the words of the New Testament (James). The test of this age is how successfully humans can accept and spread the Gospel, the "good news," of the Lord. The question of what happens next, what will be God's judgment at the end of this age, is answered by the evangelical beliefs regarding the millennium.

Dwight Moody promoted the doctrine of premillennialism, in contrast to Charles Finney's earlier views of postmillennialism. The distinction between these two views is extremely significant, as it presents the two different views that evangelicals hold regarding their responsibilities for the well-being of the world around them. Postmillennialism is the view that "American society was improving so rapidly that God would soon bring ordinary history to a conclusion and inaugurate a thousand years of peace and prosperity, after which Christ would return to reign forever with his faithful saints" (Martin 7). The amazing improvements in society were to come about through the works and reform initiated by Christians. According to a postmillennialist view, it is only through human effort that this glorious millennial age can be achieved, after which Christ will reappear to glorify His true believers (James).

Unlike postmillennialists, premillennialists such as Dwight Moody believe that human effort does not play a role in the Second Coming of Christ. From this perspective, the world is deteriorating rapidly, and humans can do nothing to stop it. The only hope is that Christ will reappear and "transform a wicked creation and personally inaugurate the millennium" (Martin 7). When Christ reappears, the Rapture of the Church will occur, and all of the true believers will be taken up into heaven. A period of tribulation, the terrible destruction of the earth and the nonbelievers, will follow. Once all of the wickedness has been destroyed, Christ and his Church will reclaim the earth and begin a new age of glory (James). Premillennialists tend to believe that it is pointless to expend energy in the pursuit of social reform, because individual and universal salvation can be achieved only through the grace of God, not as reward for attempts to improve the world. Instead of working for universal improvement, these Christians tend to focus upon individual piety, getting themselves right with God (James).

Combining the notions of dispensationalism and premillennialism, as Moody and his followers have done, one arrives at a theology that promotes the belief that individuals need to "get

right with God" in order to receive his grace (James). According to a dispensationalist view, this can be achieved by spreading the Gospel of the Lord, the words and teachings of Jesus Christ. This is how believers can carry out the will of God on earth. However, it does not mean that these evangelical Christians need to fulfill any obligations to the greater society, as only Christ can improve the world at large. This theology, the combination of the two perspectives, is a very common feature in modern Fundamentalist churches and Bible institutes, including Dwight Moody's namesake.

Whereas Moody was strongly rooted in theology, his successor as the preeminent urban revivalist in America was less concerned with lofty doctrine and more focused upon legislation. Billy Sunday, a former major league baseball player, preached to millions of people in many of America's largest cities during his career as a revivalist minister (Reid 331). This preacher, known as the "Calliope of Zion," chose to avoid the heavy problems of theology and intellectualism that were threatening traditional evangelicalism, and instead concentrated upon delivering a simple message (Martin 8). Woven into his "homey," anecdotal sermons was the assertion that "there can be no religion that does not express itself in patriotism" (Martin 9).

Sunday believed that Christians were obligated to defend "the moral standards of the Anglo-Saxon Protestant middle class," as well as supporting the social and political institutions that ruled God's nation, America (Martin 9). During the First World War, he was a vocal supporter of the war effort and a defender of President Wilson. His efforts, which included going on tour with Will Rogers in the "Wake Up America" rallies, helped in encouraging young men to enlist and in selling war bonds to American citizens (Martin 9). He was well established in the world of Big Business, championing the sort of capitalist economic principles that earned him the support and friendship of people with names like Rockefeller, Carnegie, Morgan, Swift, Armour, Edison, and Marshall Field (Martin 10). Sunday used his rather powerful status to promote his beliefs in moral perfectionism, continuing the fight against profanity, obscenity, gambling, sex, and alcohol. Through his efforts, Sunday is one of the people credited with the passage of the Prohibition amendment (Reid 331). The model of a fundamentalist preacher established by Sunday, that of a religious figure with strong ties in business and politics, is one that has been copied a number of times in the twentieth century by such individuals as Billy Graham, Jerry Falwell, and Pat Robertson.

In the years between 1910 and 1915, the sort of traditionalist evangelical Christianity espoused by Dwight Moody and Billy Sunday earned a name all of its own: Fundamentalism. It was in this period that a series twelve paper-back volumes entitled *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth* were published and distributed around the country in response to many of the modernist challenges to conservative Christianity (Martin 10-11, Balmer xv). Many scholars cite the publication of these volumes as the beginning of the organized Fundamentalist movement in America (Reid 140). This series, which provided the traditionalist movement with its name, outlined the main beliefs embraced by conservative evangelicals, which are as follows: the complete inerrancy of the Bible, the reality of the Virgin Birth, the deity of Christ, the

substitutionary atonement of Christ's death, the Resurrection, and the belief that Christ's Return is imminent (James, Martin 11). The basis for each of these beliefs is summarized in the first, that the Bible is inerrant. Thus, every single word in the Scriptures is true, and must be interpreted literally. These beliefs, as outlined in *The Fundamentals*, are the basic theological tenets that form the foundation of the modern Fundamentalist movement.

Though Fundamentalists had eased one of their conflicts by distancing themselves from the larger, more liberal evangelical movement, they still faced challenges from the outside world. Their greatest obstacle was and is in the form of the growing popularity of secular humanism, an ideology that promotes "enduring human values, scientific knowledge, and cultivation of literature, arts and philosophy," instead of a theology centered the worship of a divine figure (Martin 195). In their early years, Fundamentalists faced two strong threats from the secular camp,especially from the scholarly realm, that have remained their greatest challenges: biblical criticism and evolution.

In the first few decades of this century, one of the main obstacles to the Fundamentalist worldview was the emerging field of biblical criticism. Coming out of Germany at the end of the nineteenth century, biblical criticism (or "higher criticism," "source criticism" or "historical criticism") was a scholarly pursuit for the historical accuracy of the Bible (James). The scholars participating in this endeavor compared historical evidence to the accounts detailed in the biblical text, checking the veracity of the latter (James, Balmer 34). In addition, these critics claimed to have determined the authorship of much of the Old Testament, and that their findings confirmed the idea that several different people wrote the text and that some passages contradicted others (James).

How did Fundamentalists respond to this challenge to their inerrant Scriptures? In a tremendous show of religious nationalism, many of the movement's leaders at the time attacked biblical criticism by attacking its "source:" Germany (Martin 11). During the war years, Billy Sunday and others began to preach that Satan was behind Germany's aggression, that it was all a plan to have evil take over the world. According to the Fundamentalist leaders, Satan's evil campaign began with German biblical criticism, an attempt to draw believers from around the world away from God (Martin 11). Although this conspiracy theory may have worked among the Fundamentalist ranks, the ideas never really took hold in the greater culture, and the scholarly pursuit of higher criticism is still a threat to the movement today.

The second main threat to Fundamentalism came from the increasingly secular world of science. In 1859, Charles Darwin published his seminal work, *The Origin of the Species*, and the world began debating the controversial topic of evolution (Balmer 34). Fundamentalists believed that the Darwinian theory of evolution was in direct conflict with their view of biblical inerrancy, as it contradicted with the Genesis account of Creation. Since, in their view, the Bible is completely accurate, then evolution must be a false sort of doctrine. Many Fundamentalists took it upon themselves to prevent the spread of evolutionary ideas, and several southern states (Oklahoma, Texas, Mississippi, Arkansas, Florida, and Tennessee) passed laws regarding the inclusion of evolution in schools' curricula (Martin 14).

Perhaps the defining event of early Fundamentalist history occurred in Dayton, Tennessee

in 1925. A young biology teacher at the local high school, John T. Scopes, used textbooks in his classes that included segments describing Darwin's theory of evolution. This was a violation of the Butler Act, which prohibited the teaching of evolution in public classrooms (Iannone 28). Local Fundamentalists decided to take this teacher to court, and the result was one of the most intriguing legal dramas of American history. Scopes's defense was led by Clarence Darrow, a self-proclaimed agnostic, and supported by the American Civil Liberties Union, and together they faced "the Great Commoner," William Jennings Bryan, representing the Fundamentalist cause (Martin 15, Gould 16).

Although the prosecution had a pretty clear-cut case, having only to prove that Scopes did use the books with evolutionary material in them, Darrow and his defense team managed to turn the trial away from the relatively simple matter of teaching evolution to an attack on biblical literalism and creationism. During the trial, Darrow even called Bryan himself to the stand and interrogated him regarding the accuracy of the Bible, and the testimony that followed proved to be one of the most damning moments for American Fundamentalists. Bryan was unable to answer Darrow's questions regarding the literal interpretation of such events as "how Eve could be created from Adam's rib, where Cain got his wife, or where the great fish came from that swallowed Jonah" (Marsden 186). Bryan eventually admitted that he never really gave much thought to the historical accuracy of the Bible, he just accepted what he had been told (Marsden 187). Through the use of ridicule, Darrow painted an image of Bryan, and thus Fundamentalists, as one of the "bigots and ignoramuses" that was holding back modern liberal culture in America (Marsden 187).

Although the jury eventually reached a "guilty" verdict, history has shown that Fundamentalism was the actual loser at that Tennessee courthouse. The trial received a great deal of media attention, and reports often portrayed Bryan's and the Fundamentalists' efforts as "a virtual carnival, complete with sideshows" (Iannone 28). One particular journalist, "arch-cynic" H. L. Mencken, sent news of Bryan's deteriorating case and image around the country (Martin 15). Even when Bryan died less than a week after the trial, Mencken continued his derisive portrayal of Fundamentalists in the national papers, claiming that the movement's main motivation in the Scopes trial was not the fight against evolution but an attack on the growing urban culture of America (Marsden 187-188). Whatever their agenda in embarking upon this legal effort, the Fundamentalists did not achieve it. Their only hope for validation of their efforts, the jury's verdict, was eventually reversed on a technicality, and Scopes was released (Reid 307). The only result of the trial, and its subsequent treatment by the press, was the creation of a "country-bumpkin" image of Fundamentalists that continued to plague them for years after the event. They began to view the larger society as antagonistic and hostile to their religious beliefs, and responded by retreating from the mainstream and beginning a decades-long period of social separatism (Balmer 43).

In addition to this historical reason for separation from the rest of society, Fundamentalists subscribe to a doctrine that teaches them to avoid the temptations and influences of the outside world. Their interpretation of several passages of the Bible established a doctrine of

both ecclesiastical and ethical separatism, meaning that Fundamentalists must avoid associating with churches that subscribe to beliefs other than their own as well as avoid people and situations that present the worldly temptations of the flesh (James). Justification for these practices can be found in the following passages:

- Adulterers! Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Therefore whoever wishes to be a friend of the world becomes an enemy of God. (James 4: 4)

- Do not love the world or the things in the world. The love of the Father is not in those who love the world; for all that is in the world - the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, the pride in riches - comes not from the Father but from the world. And the world and its desire are passing away, but those who do the will of God live forever. (1 John: 15 - 17).

- Do not be mismatched with unbelievers. For what partnership is there between righteousness and lawlessness? ... Therefore come out from them, and be separate from them, says the Lord, and touch nothing unclean; then I will welcome you, and I will be your father, and you shall be my sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty. (2 Corinthians 6: 14, 17 - 18)

These passages, along with several others, provide the Fundamentalists with scriptural justification for the separatist stance that they embraced following the Scopes trial.

Although Fundamentalists virtually disappeared from the American social and political arena in the middle decades of this century, they remained quite active within their own subculture. As even their critics acknowledged, theirs was a huge movement. At the time of the Scopes trial, Mencken complained about the sheer numbers of the Fundamentalist movement: "Heave an egg out of a Pullman window and you will hit a Fundamentalist almost anywhere in the United States today" (Balmer 2). A group as large as this one did not just vanish.

In the 1930s, several Fundamentalist leaders initiated a transformation in the movement, "shifting, realigning, and reorganizing its base" (Martin 17). Because they wanted to remain separate from the larger American society, they created a large network and infrastructure with the movement that allowed for a high degree of self-sufficiency. Central to the success of this infrastructure was the creation of a number of large, independent congregations centered around a somewhat larger-than-life pastor. In order to continue training their younger members for the ministry or for good Christian lives, many of these churches also established Bible colleges, modeled after the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago (Martin 17). These Fundamentalist congregations were also quite adept at using methods of mass communication to spread their message through the subculture. Several pastors had extremely successful radio ministries, most notable Charles E. Fuller. His *Old Fashioned Revival Hour*, which became a model for later evangelists, reached an audience of approximately ten million listeners in 1939 (Martin 18).

While many Americans at the time believed that Fundamentalists' absence on the national stage meant that they had faded away, history has shown that this period of obscurity was actually a time of strengthening and growth for the movement. After a few decades of this silent progress,

Fundamentalists and many of their evangelical counterparts were poised to jump back into the fray of American politics and culture, this time much stronger.

Jerry Falwell: Pastor or Politician?

Over the course of his career, Reverend Jerry Falwell has become one of the most recognized figures of the Christian church in America. His name tends to evoke polarized yet equally passionate responses: people seem to either admire him greatly or despise him and all that he represents. Who is Jerry Falwell? What has he done to evoke such strong responses from people? Is he a religious leader or a political figure, or both? How does he reconcile his religious beliefs with his political actions? And, most importantly, how has he been able to lead such large numbers of Fundamentalists, members of a formerly separatist sect, into their current position of prominence on the American political scene? These are all questions that the following case study addresses, tracing Falwell's career from the beginnings of the Thomas Road Baptist Church ministries, through the years of the Moral Majority, and up to his current efforts with the God Save America crusade.

On June 17, 1956, a small group of people gathered together in an elementary school in Lynchburg, Virginia to hear the words of a dynamic young preacher by the name of Jerry Falwell (Campbell). A recent graduate of the Baptist Bible College in Springfield, Missouri, Falwell had returned to his hometown to set up his ministry. The young pastor did not come from a particularly religious family, his father was an alcoholic that never attended church and his mother occasionally listened to Charles Fuller's *Old Fashioned Revival Hour*, but he had been baptized into the Baptist church in his teens (Martin 56). When he returned to Lynchburg, Falwell claims to have officially invited every family in town to join his new church. Within a few months of his first sermon, the Reverend began broadcasting his services over the local radio station. A few months later, less than a year after that first meeting in the elementary school, Falwell had moved into the world of television, broadcasting his Sunday morning services every week as the *Old Time Gospel Hour*. These initial broadcasts were just the beginning of the extensive media campaign that would come to characterize Falwell's ministries. By 1964, just eight years after his ministry began, Falwell's congregation had moved three times, finally settling on a property on Thomas Road in Lynchburg. They had established the Elim Home, a rehabilitation center for alcoholic men, and they were in the process of building a new facility that would house their growing Sunday School program. At this early point in his career, Falwell already numbered his congregation at over a thousand people (Campbell).

Although Falwell's career up to this time may seem almost blessed, as he had achieved huge success as a pastor, the Reverend already had a history of controversy surrounding his ministries. The earliest controversies stemmed from Falwell's position on race, and his emerging tendency to bend the truth in order to avoid the burden of accountability for his previous actions. As mentioned, the official history of the Thomas Road Baptist Church claims that Falwell

personally invited every single family in Lynchburg to join his congregation. However, according to the Church's membership records, there were no black members of the congregation until the 1970s, fifteen years later (Martin 56). So, it appears unlikely that Falwell's original story, which evokes the positive image of an inclusive and idealistic young man of God, is based on fact.

Falwell officially addressed the topic of race in the 1958 sermon, "Separation or Integration: Which?" In his homily, the Reverend "asserted that integration was not only wrong but would lead to the destruction of the white race" (Martin 58). Asked years later to comment upon this sermon, Falwell defended his position by placing it in the context of the times:

> As I recall, everyone who had taught me was a segregationist. As far as I knew at the time, every minister in this town was a segregationist - I mean among the white pastors. So that was no big deal. That kind of sermon was preached everywhere. (Martin 57-58).

He continued his defense by explaining that he quickly realized the erroneous nature of his views, and amended them accordingly. Falwell then related a story that seemed to exonerate his earlier actions:

> But the real test came - it was probably 1960 or '61 - when a black family came forward to join our church and wanted to be baptized. I said, 'All right, I'll baptize you,' and I did... We lost a couple of families over that, but just that quickly it was all over. And as far as I know, we became the first church in this town to aggressively begin ministering to everyone... And it caused criticism - in the city, in the community, not just in the church. There were people wondering, 'What is this young preacher trying to do, ruin our town? (Martin 58).

Again, Falwell portrays the image of a young, inclusive, and idealistic preacher trying to save the souls of everyone that he can. Unfortunately, it appears that this story is also fabricated. Falwell's congregation was segregated until 1968, and the first baptism of a black member did not occur until 1971, ten years after this story claimed that it happened (Martin 58). These events, which occurred relatively early in Falwell's ministries, are merely the first examples of the types of controversy, exclusivity, and somewhat revisionist tales that characterize the Reverend's career.

As his church continued to grow in both numbers and influence, there was one point on which Falwell remained adamant: a pastor belongs in the pulpit, not in politics. He first revealed this teaching in the mid-1960s, in a time when a number of ministers were stepping out of the pulpits and into the streets to join in the many social movements of the decade. In his March 1965 sermon, "Ministers and Marches," Dr. Falwell clearly outlined his view regarding this growing trend of pastoral activism:

> ...our [ministers'] only purpose on this earth is to know Christ and to make him known. Believing the Bible as I do, I would find it impossible to stop preaching the pure saving Gospel of Jesus Christ and begin doing anything else - including the fighting of communism or participating in the civil rights reform... Preachers are not called to be politicians, but to be soul winners (Martin 69-70).

As the remaining details of this case will show, this view does not characterize the remainder of Falwell's career. In the years since this sermon, Falwell has admitted that he was wrong at the time

(he has even called these words an example of "false prophecy"), and that his original intent was to convince pastors to try to change people's hearts through preaching, not politics (Martin 70). Yet, Falwell's critics identify this retraction as another example of the Reverend's tendency to alter the truth at a later date to suit his convenience.

Although Falwell decried ministerial involvement in politics in the 1960s, he did not refrain from reacting to decisions made in the political arena. Most notably, Falwell took it upon himself to respond to the Supreme Court decisions of 1962-3 that banned prayer and use of the Bible in the public schools. Afraid that the the government was attempting to "eliminate[d]" the "Christian world view," Falwell announced his own plans to create an educational system that would prevent this from happening (Martin 71). In the later years of that decade, Falwell and his supporters established the Lynchburg Christian Academy, which would eventually serve children in grades K - 12, and the Lynchburg Baptist College (now Liberty University). The Reverend explained his motivation for this endeavor:

> To maintain the strength of what all of us feel America was established upon, the Christian principles of life, it was necessary to focus our attention on education, because that was the heart of the nation. (Martin 71)

Predictably, this move into a new realm of society sparked controversy and scorn. Some critics put forth the idea that Falwell's main motivation to create his own educational system was the desire to establish a "private school for white students" (Martin 70).

In the years that followed, however, Falwell did attempt to reconcile himself with the minority community in Lynchburg. There were three students enrolled in the Academy in its second year - Falwell claims that the earlier lack of representation was the result of a corresponding lack of minority applications. In addition, Thomas Road began a "bus ministry" outreach program in the late '60's, trying to involve members of minority communities in the Church's activities (Martin 72).

The Moral Majority

On the political front, conservative leaders, disappointed with national trends demonstrated by the 1964 election, began looking for ways to improve their future performance with voters. Morton Blackwell, a Goldwater supporter in 1964, believed that the answer lied in recruitment. Recently, he explained the plan that he thought would help the conservative cause:

> If you can identify some segment of the population which is not active and can be activated, or some segment that is miscast in their current party affiliation and can be switched over to your side, you're going to change things dramatically...[Christians were] the greatest tract of virgin timber on the landscape... We set about quite systematically to identify leaders, to teach them how to become effective, how to organize, how to communicate, how to raise funds, how to use direct-mail technology - skills that would make them more effective. (Martin 191)

One of the religious leaders that these conservatives identified was Reverend Jerry Falwell.

However, before conservative politicians could approach Falwell and his colleagues, they had to find a "hook," a reason for these Christian leaders to become involved in politics. They found their hook in the for of a controversial and divisive topic that had already been the subject of a landmark Supreme Court Case: abortion. Several of these hard-line conservatives, including C. Everett Koop and the evangelicals Francis Schaeffer and journalist Harold O. J. Brown, began an anti-abortion campaign among Christian circles. They produced and distributed a film, *Whatever Happened to the Human Race?*, that presented a terrifying vision of a future in which people had lost all appreciation for the sanctity of human life and the unnatural death rate had changed accordingly (Martin 194). According to Koop and Brown, their campaign was successful in forcing Christians to rethink their position of inactivity in terms of the abortion issue. They believe that their work, including the film, was a key factor influencing Christians to extend their religious fervor from the pew to the voting booth (Martin 194).

Falwell was intrigued by these anti-abortion efforts, and became increasingly more involved in the conservatives' efforts. He invited Schaeffer to visit Liberty University, and instituted a policy requiring all LU students to view Schaeffer's films (Martin 196-197). In turn, Schaeffer convinced Falwell to use his *Old Time Gospel Hour* to spread their anti-abortion message and encourage his audience to take a more active role in politics, opposing such immorality as abortion (Martin 197). Eventually, Falwell expanded his political views into the debate over homosexuality and pornography, using his broadcast capabilities to spread the conservative agenda to Fundamentalists throughout the country (Martin 197-198).

In May of 1979, Jerry Falwell attended a meeting with several leading conservatives, both political and corporate figures, at the Holiday Inn in Lynchburg. At this meeting, the attendees devised the ideal vehicle through which Falwell's religion and conservative politics could be combined: the Moral Majority (Martin 200). A few weeks later, the Moral Majority took up its official residence in Washington, listing several conservative politicians and businessmen and Jerry Falwell on its board of directors. In his book *Listen, America!*, Falwell claimed that the Moral Majority was designed to be an organization that was "pro-life, pro-family, pro-moral, and pro-American" (Martin 201).

How did Jerry Falwell reconcile his new political activity with the conservative, *pre*millennialist theology that he preached at Thomas Road? (Premillennialism is the belief that human effort to improve the state of the world is wasted effort, as only Christ can transform the wickedness of the world into glory). How did he explain his own role in American politics? Did he provide his followers, and critics, with an elaborate theological explanation for this change of heart? No, he did not. In fact, as far as the research for this paper has shown, Falwell has never come out and explained how he circumvents the inherent contradiction between his theology and his politics. Some scholars believe that the Reverend never really had a change of heart, he just decided to go in the direction that suited him at a given time, be it a theological or a political one (James). A member of the Thomas Road congregation, Ed Dobson, recalls the moment when Falwell announced his political plans to members of the Church:

> My observation is that the deterioration of American culture compelled him to do something, and he did it before he thought through precisely what he was going to do. I don't know if it was a Monday or a Thursday or a Saturday, but one morning he woke up and said, 'If not me, then who? And if not now, when?' and decided he had to do something. And then we all woke up one morning and realized we had founded the Moral Majority. (Martin 200)

Another long-standing member of the Church, Nancy Godsey, was confident about her pastor's decision: "Somebody had to take a stand. I think Dr. Falwell was the one to do it because he gets his wisdom and knowledge from God" (Martin 202). As evidenced by these two church members, Falwell's loyal followers at Thomas Road did not seem to see a problem in the meshing of their Fundamentalist religion and American politics.

The Moral Majority, under Falwell's leadership, grew to be one of the most influential organizations of the Religious Right in the 1970s and 1980s. Although the actual membership numbers are disputed, scholars have quoted the numerical strength of the Moral Majority to be roughly in the range between 500,000 and 3 million members (Moen). Following a three-part mission of Registration, Information, and Mobilization, the organization was quite successful in its attempts to encourage Christians to register to vote, and to vote for the Christian agenda (Martin 201, Moen). Through his broadcasts, his "I Love America" national tour and rallies, and the Moral Majority branch offices that he helped to establish, Jerry Falwell was a driving force behind this mobilization of the Christian Right. These efforts resulted in the registration of millions (estimated) of new voters (Martin 201-203, Moen).

Falwell even credits himself, among others, with the election of the pro-family, Christian-friendly presidential candidate, Ronald Reagan (Martin 220). During many of his rallies, as he urged voters to support the Christian candidate, Reagan, Falwell used explicit imagery to describe the state of a nation without Christian leadership. Often, he showed a 90-minute presentation filled with "images of Charles Manson, Times Square "adult" theaters, aborted fetuses in bloody hospital pans, nuclear explosions," and a variety of other 'immoral' and 'threatening' symbols of a land that had turned away from God (Martin 218). Falwell and his colleagues were quite successful, for a while. The Religious Right and the ideals that it espoused were very influential in American politics in the 1980s, on topics ranging from abortion and school prayer to flag burning and family values.

However, as the 1980s continued, the Religious Right experienced a period of transition that resulted in a number of changes, including with the Moral Majority (Moen). In January of 1986, Falwell announced that he was dissolving the Moral Majority because it had already served its purpose of bringing Christian ideals into the political arena (Reid 227, Martin 270). The organization merged into a Falwell-led group known as the Liberty Federation, which was focused upon more religious and less political interests than the Moral Majority (Moen). Some critics and commentators saw this transition as a way for Falwell to exit the political arena quietly at a time when his efforts were no longer effective or appreciated (Martin 270). Except for a brief stint in which he succeeded Jim Bakker as the director of the Praise the Lord ministries, Falwell remained

focused upon his hometown efforts, the Thomas Road ministries, for the several years following the dissolution of the Moral Majority (Martin 276).

Jesus First: Thomas Road Baptist Church

Located in a quiet, residential neighborhood in Lynchburg, the Thomas Road Baptist Church is the center of a huge religious empire. Here, at Jerry Falwell's headquarters, a person can join the thousands of individuals that attend the Sunday services, the Wednesday night services, the Sunday School lessons, the many events sponsored for children and young adults, and the meetings of the Thomas Road Equipping Institute. The Elim Home for alcoholic men still provides rehabilitation for those that are down on their luck and have turned to Christ for help. Just a short drive away, Liberty University is the home and learning center for thousands of young people that want to live and learn in a Christian setting (or whose parents want them to live and learn in a Christian setting). But, a loyal Christian does not actually have to go to Lynchburg in order to participate in the Thomas Road brand of Christianity. Through the "Judea Project," cable subscribers in twelve states and the District of Columbia (as listed in the Judea Project State Report that is distributed at the services in Lynchburg) can view the weekly services in the comfort of their own home.

The typical Sunday morning worship service at Thomas Road Baptist Church is a grand affair.Many church members, children and adults, arrive an hour or so early in order to attend the weekly Sunday School lesson that is held in the auditorium before the service. As eleven o'clock draws near, a few uniformed police officers arrive outside the Church's building complex in order to direct traffic into the several different parking lots that service the facility. When eleven does arrive and the auditorium is filled to capacity, Jonathan Falwell, the Reverend's son and an associate pastor, comes out to begin the service, extending a welcome to the congregation and introducing the program for the day. Over the course of the next hour and a half, there is music provided by soloists, a select choir, and a chorus of hundreds of church members. Reverend Falwell usually appears to give the sermon, or in the case of a guest preacher, to lead the offering of both prayers and donations. All the while, a crew of cameramen and technicians tape the services for broadcast on the Reverend's *Old Time Gospel Hour*.

There is very little participation on the part of the church members, except at the end of the service. At this time, Reverend Falwell urges anyone in the audience that has felt the Spirit move them during the course of the service to approach the front to be baptized and welcomed into the Church. Those that do have the privilege of hearing Reverend Falwell announce their name to the congregation, and sharing in a joint prayer of thanks for their acceptance of the Spirit. These new members of the Church are then encouraged to remain at the front, where they will be met by one of the pastoral staff that will discuss their faith, and their church membership, with them. Overall, the service is a very neatly orchestrated affair, timed almost to the minute for the purposes of the video cameras. Reverend Falwell is very ingratiating, offering prayers to individual members of

the church - who get the honor of having their name broadcast in twelve states and the District of Columbia - that are in need or that are celebrating a joyous event in their lives. At the end of the hour and a half, the members of the audience are ushered out of the building to the sound of more heavenly hymns, and are encouraged to stay and talk with a pastor about anything that they may have on their mind. However, it appears that most members of the congregation instead choose to beat the crowd out to the parking lot. Many of them return on Wednesdays for the mid-week services and lesson.

In addition to the worship and lessons, members of the congregation are provided with an all-encompassing service from the Church: the Thomas Road Equipping Institute. This program, under the motto "Equipping you for... the daily walk... family... relationships... career... ministry... leadership... equipped for life!", is a part of the Wednesday night line-up at Thomas Road. The Institute, as outlined in another pamphlet handed out at the Sunday service, "exists to promote spiritual growth in the members of Thomas Road Baptist Church, by providing a selection of topical, needs-oriented equipping seminars." These seminars are divided into seven different categories, to meet the needs of every single member of the church: the Children's Ministries, Plugged In, Living Proof University, Biblical Studies, Young Adults, Parenting, and Life Management. The Children's Ministries provide lessons and activities for those members of the church that are in the sixth grade or younger. Plugged In, the middle school program, provides preteens with activities that "set the stage for middle schoolers to get "real" and join their friends in accountability groups where discipleship is the end result." Living Proof University, designed for high schoolers, is a seminar series developed around the themes of fellowship, prayer, and worship. For those between the ages of 18 and 30, the Young Adults seminar provides lessons on the following topics: Out of Their Faces and Into Their Shoes, A Woman's Heart, and The Meaning of a Man. Adults have three different seminars to choose from, Biblical Studies, Parenting, and Life Management; these cover topics ranging from Finances and Health to Communicating with Your Kids. Basically, it would appear that these seminars aim to address any question that a church member might have about living life as a Christian.

The God Save America Crusade

After the dissolution of the Moral Majority and his relatively inconspicuous presence on the American stage in the 1990's, many people have wondered about the future of Falwell's ministries. For a while, it appeared that Falwell was in an irreversible period of decline. He had financial and administrative troubles at Liberty University, as he made severe personnel cuts and restrictions in order to escape the more than $80 million debt that the school has accrued under his management (Kennedy). However, in the past year or so, Falwell's star has begun to rise again. He has once again made a name for himself in the public eye, voicing his opinions in the media. People can catch him on television often, as he makes frequent appearances on talk shows such as *Larry King Live* and *Politically Incorrect with Bill Maher*. He made the news recently when he

called for advertisers to protest the television show *Ellen*, which will soon air an episode depicting the main character's coming out experience. On the big screen, he even played himself in a movie that was nominated for several Oscars (*The People vs. Larry Flynt* - Falwell was an outspoken opponent of Flynt and his magazine, *Hustler*). In the midst of all of this regained celebrity, Reverend Falwell has been touring the nation again, in the hopes of causing a new era of revival and Christian influence in politics and society.

Begun in September 1996, the God Save America crusade is Falwell's means of "calling this nation and Canada to repentance, prayer, and fasting" (Falwell 7/14/96). He claims that the nation's leaders, whether Republican or Democrat, "do not... have the solutions to America's moral and spiritual dilemma" (Falwell). Instead, he believes that he has been called to effect a widespread spiritual awakening in America before she succumbs to the final judgment of God (Falwell). Falwell claims that "God has called me to be a voice crying in the wilderness... to mobilize, inform, and inspire...America" (Kennedy 62). The Crusade consists of a 52-week journey through North America, with rallies held at local churches along the way. Each of these rallies is televised during Falwell's weekly program, the *Old Time Gospel Hour*, so that it can reach millions of viewers around the world (Falwell).

Falwell's teachings about the role that Christians must play in the salvation of America can be found in his sermons. From the pulpit of churches around the country, he urges followers to be active, to participate in American government and politics so that they can ensure the maintenance of Christian ideals in this society. The following excerpts from his sermon "God's Plan to Save a Nation," given on July 21, 1996 (found in its entirety in the appendix of this paper), demonstrate the methods that Falwell uses to gain the commitment of his followers:

- It is important that believers are good citizens. We must render to Caesar that which is Caesar's. Only in an environment of freedom and good government can we openly and aggressively pursue national reform and repentance.

- I challenge the members of this local church and the Christian family at large to rise up and rebuild the fallen walls (of America)...

- I strongly believe that America is perilously close to experiencing the judgment of God.

- Only a pervasive and national spiritual awakening can prevent us entering the post-Christian era as we go into the 21st century.

- America is in imminent peril. We are rotting from within. Our families are falling apart at a 50% divorce rate. Teen pregnancies...Abortion, homosexuality, drugs and violence have become "the American way." Like Esther who heeded Mordecai's appeal to ask the King to save the Jewish people, we too must approach the King with our pleas for national deliverance.

- Our only hope lies in the pulpits and pews of our 200,000 Bible-believing churches in America... We have the resources, under God's empowerment, to change the culture.

- National revival is definitely possible. Nothing is too hard for the Lord.

Through entreaties using this combination of imagery and scare tactics that has worked in his past efforts with the Religious Right, Falwell is hoping once again to make the Christian Right a formidable voting body that will shape American history in the next millennium.

Analysis

In examining the preceding case, a number of contradictions emerge. Jerry Falwell is a Fundamentalist Baptist preacher, rooted in a long-standing tradition of social, political, religious, and ethical separation from mainstream American society. However, in the past few decades, Reverend Falwell has been one of the loudest voices in the American political dialogue. As he is a Fundamentalist minister, one might expect Jerry Falwell to refrain from using self-glorifying methods to get his message across. Yet, as mentioned above, he seems to revel in his near-celebrity status without always using his position to convey a Christian message. And finally, the Reverend's career appears to be marked by a number of questionable instances, times in which the pastor has twisted the truth to suit his purposes. Yet, his followers remain loyal. What is the key to Jerry Falwell's success? How has he led his followers to their position of increased power and influence in this country in the 1970s and 1980s, and how has he managed to keep those followers in the 1990s? The following analysis presents the argument that it is Jerry Falwell's charismatic leadership style that lies at the heart of the answers to these questions.

Jerry Falwell, in his ministry of the Thomas Road Baptist Church and in his various other pursuits in the fields of religion and politics, has shown himself to be a charismatic leader. Like David Koresh, the Reverend fits the general description of an "envisioning," "energizing," and "enabling" leader, as laid out by Nadler and Tushman. He has articulated a vision that is appealing to his followers: he wants all Christians to work together to save America from destroying herself in a potentially post-Christian era. In conveying this vision, Falwell employs a great deal of imagery and symbolism. As seen in the excerpts from his sermon presented above, the Reverend uses Biblical references as a rhetorical device to add to the power of the imagery. For example, he refers to Esther and Mordecai, who were characters in the Old Testament. Esther was a Jewish queen that begged a foreign king to show mercy to the Jews and prevent their destruction. By alluding to this story, Falwell is telling his followers that they, like Esther, need to beg God for America's salvation. Falwell's methods are dynamic. By staging a year-long Crusade that crisscrosses the continent, he will be gathering together thousands of people and uniting them for a single cause. This sort of activity, a spiritual rallying cry, is both engaging and energizing. Falwell's assertion that Christians can make a difference, that they have "the resources...to change the culture," is evidence for the level of confidence that he has in both himself and his followers' abilities. This sort of confidence from a leader is empowering, adding to the level of followers' commitments by increasing their own self-efficacy.

The individual traits of the leader in question are the focus of House and Howell's theory of personality and charismatic leadership. As in the case of David Koresh, the example of Jerry Falwell could be interpreted in two different ways according to this theory, based upon whether or not the Reverend is sincere in his preaching. If Falwell is honest about his beliefs and his spiritual agenda, then he could be identified as a socialized leader, one that is interested in the collective needs and empowerment of the group. As one called to the ministry by God, Falwell would not be motivated by a need for power, Machiavellianism, or Narcissism. Because, if Falwell's rhetoric is true, he did not make the actual decision to join the ministry, these individual reasons to aspire to power are not relevant.

If, however, Falwell is a fraud and does not really believe the theology that he preaches, then he would fit the mold of a personalized leader. A career such as Falwell's, if built on insincerity, would have to be built upon a high level of a need for power, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism. Examples of these personality traits can be seen in the frequent instances of Falwell's lying, as well as his fondness for being on camera. Falwell's status could be maintained through a high degree of authoritarianism, which is characterized by a combination of aggression, submission, and conventionalism. By remaining submissive and conventional, remaining within the norms of society, Falwell is able to sustain his "accepted outsider" status. However, through occasional aggression, Falwell and his followers are able to validate their own self-identification as God's true believers, the possessors of divine truths. By remaining separate, they have been able to maintain a superior attitude towards groups of lesser status (i. e. homosexuals, immigrants, welfare recipients, etc.). Arguing from either perspective, it is difficult to say how Falwell's self-esteem and locus of control fit into his leadership style. Either way, the Reverend appears to have a high degree of self-esteem, which would indicate a socialized leadership style. However, his apparent locus of control does not seem to make sense when considered with the overall picture of his leadership style. If he is sincere in his beliefs, then he would have an external locus of control (God). Yet, that would identify him as a personalized leader. As mentioned earlier, Falwell's sincerity would indicate that he is a socialized, not personalized, leader. If one considers Falwell insincere, with an internal locus of control, the conflict arises again from the opposite angle.

Because it has more to do with followers' perceptions than leader traits, Conger and Kanungo's attributional theory of charismatic leadership applies to Reverend Falwell whether or not he is sincere in his Christianity. According to this theory, a leader is charismatic if his (her) followers believe that he is charismatic. The four main variables that Conger and Kanungo use to determine charismatic leadership in a situation are as follows: the degree of discrepancy between the status quo and the leader's vision, the use of innovative means to achieve change, a realistic assessment of the environment, and the use of strong rhetorical skills and impression management. In Falwell's case, there is a large disparity between the current situation, one that he describes as a time of imminent doom, and the future vision, which he sees as the glorious arrival of the

Kingdom of God. Beginning in the 1950s, Falwell made use of the airwaves in his ministry. Regular broadcasts of his weekly services, especially in the early years of television, were an innovative way to spread his message around the country. As believers that subscribe to the same Fundamentalist doctrine that he promotes, it would seem that most of Falwell's followers probably agree that the Reverend has a realistic view of the world around them and all of its evils. As seen in his sermons, Falwell is a powerful speaker. He weaves together Old Testament prophecy, New Testament theology, current political discourse, anecdotes and apocalyptic imagery into his weekly sermons, painting a vivid picture of his spiritual vision and goals. As far as impression management goes, Falwell himself seems to be quick to revise any of his past words that could damage his image. Since this is the case, he probably has a number of people that assist him in his impression management efforts. In addition to these four variables, Falwell's followers believe that he is a link between them and God, that he is at some superhuman level. Attributing this sort of status to Falwell clearly shows that his followers believe him to be a charismatic leader.

Perhaps one of Falwell's greatest talents is his ability to inspire commitment in followers by aligning his vision with their self-concepts. The Shamir, House, and Arthur self-concept theory of charismatic leadership outlines five key motivational processes important to the success of a charismatic leader. As presented in the preceding case, Jerry Falwell has been successful in using these motivational processes to evoke loyalty and commitment from his followers. The first tactic, through which a leader aligns the values of the group with the values of the individual followers, is best seen in Falwell's efforts to mesh together two self-concepts that followers already have. Much of the brilliance of his ministry can be found in his attempts to show followers that the ideals of good Christianity and good citizenship are one and the same. In other words, Falwell has convinced many of his followers that in order to be good Christians, they need to be good citizens, and vice versa. By equating these two self-concepts with each other, Falwell has essentially united them into a single self-concept that is even stronger than the sum of its parts. Reverend Falwell has succeeded in using the remaining four motivational processes outlined by this theory. He has extremely high expectations for his followers, believing them to be servants of God that will join Him in the glorious future kingdom. He has placed a strong emphasis on the completed task, which is the achievement of a better future. Through these motivational tactics, especially through his uniting of the notions of good Christianity and good citizenship, Falwell has created a high level of personal commitment in his followers.

The psychoanalytic approach to charismatic leadership, as proposed by Kets de Vries and Miller, applies to the type of needs-fulfillment that Falwell's ministries provide for his followers. This theory proposes that one reason that followers remain loyal to a charismatic leader is because they have an idealized view of this leader, that he/she takes the place of an omnipotent parent or protector figure in their lives. In this case, Falwell has created a ministry that should meet every need and answer every question that his followers might have: the Thomas Road Equipping

Institute. The seminars in the Institute meet the specific needs of every group in the congregation, children, young adults, and adults, male and female, and they address nearly every topic that may come up in the day-to-day life of Fundamentalist Christians. If members of the Thomas Road community have questions regarding their finances, or love, or their health, or how to raise a teenager, Reverend Falwell has an answer. This is an extreme example of the notion of the leader as a parent/protector figure, and it matches the psychoanalytic theory's ideas of charismatic leadership.

As in the case of David Koresh, the trust that Falwell's followers place in him could be based on several reasons. First of all, he is a spiritual leader that supposedly has some link to God. For many of his followers, that status is enough to earn him unconditional trust. In addition to his pastoral role, Falwell is a community leader in the realms of education, business, and civic affairs. He is also a prominent figure on the national scene, in both politics and the media. All of these activities have earned Falwell the trust of his followers, regardless of the fact that he has been caught in several lies over the course of his career.

Jay Conger's description of the "dark side" of charismatic leadership may or may not apply to the case of Jerry Falwell. If Falwell is sincere in his beliefs, then it seems that his current situation is still one of prosperity, both personally and professionally. Although he has taken risks on this matter in the past, his advocacy of the notion that Christians need to spread their message and beliefs throughout the nation appears to be in line with the goals of his followers. They all seem to want to achieve glory in the coming kingdom of God, and most of Falwell's followers still believe that he can show them the way. If, however, Falwell is insincere in his efforts and teachings, then his congregation is at risk. The Reverend has used impression management techniques to get out of sticky situations before, and there is no way to tell if he has continued this practice. Based on this prior record, it does not require a leap in logic to wonder whether or not Falwell has told his followers the entire truth about his beliefs or his motivations. If he is hiding things from his large audience, then he and his followers may eventually find themselves in a charismatic leadership situation that has gone sour.

The methodology section of this paper posed the following question regarding the case of Jerry Falwell and his career:

> *How has Jerry Falwell led members of a formerly isolationist religious sect into an active role in mainstream American politics and society?*

This study argues that Jerry Falwell's charismatic leadership style has been a key factor in the growing involvement of Fundamentalist Christians in American politics and culture. Using a pragmatic approach, demonstrating to his followers that there are a number of issues that, as Christians, they need to address, Falwell has inspired hundreds of thousands of Christians (or more) to take a more active role in the creation of American history. He has shown many

Americans that the concepts of good Christianity and good citizenship go hand in hand, and he has encouraged them to let their religion affect their politics. In his own community, he has taken on the role of a father figure to his congregation, the one person on whom they can rely for unconditional love and support. Through his efforts on both a local and national scale, Jerry Falwell has been an integral part of the rise of the Religious Right in America, and thus a key figure in recent political history.

Conclusion

From its very inception, the general, overarching goal of this study has been to integrate two academic disciplines that had a relatively small amount of previous scholarship uniting them. This paper has shown that it is quite possible to intermingle the fields of leadership studies and religion successfully. The specific purpose of this paper was the further exploration of the topic of charismatic leadership in a relatively untouched context, that of radical religious groups in modern America. The result of this project is a lengthy treatment of the topic of charismatic leadership in two specific case studies, and the final product presents several insights regarding the nature of charismatic leadership and the variety of religious beliefs in America.

However, for as many insights as this paper offers, it also leads to several new areas of inquiry. This study presented case studies from two different religious "categories," a sect and a cult. Perhaps a study comparing and contrasting groups within the same sort of religious movement. For example, a paper comparing/contrasting the cases of Jim Jones and David Koresh, or a study examining the correlations between Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson, might provide an entirely new set of insights regarding the different manifestations of charismatic leadership within a religious context. Another possible modification of this study would be a carefully orchestrated comparison between a religious leader and a secular leader. This sort of project would have to be closely monitored, however, as it would be very difficult to find two leaders that are similar enough to compare them in a valid study. In other words, the researcher would have to find a way to isolate a single variable, the presence or lack of religious faith, and ensuring that this variable is the only difference between the two cases. In addition to these possible changes in the study, it would be possible to conduct this study again, only using different cases. That is, the researcher would choose new cases to study, yet still choose cases representing both a cult and a sect. For example, a paper comparing Heaven's Gate to the Pentecostalist movement could be quite interesting. All of these ideas could be used to extend the goal of this study, to continue the exploration of charismatic leadership in radical religious movements.

Bibliography

Balmer, Randall. *Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory: A Journey into the Evangelical Subculture in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Beck, Melinda et al. "Thy Kingdom Come." *Newsweek*. 15 Mar. 1993: 52 - 55.

Biskupic, Joan and Pierre G. Thomas. "Standoff Ensues at Texas Site." *Washington Post*. 1 Mar. 1993: A1, A6.

Bruce, Steve. *Religion in the Modern World: From Cathedrals to Cults*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Campbell, Linwood. "Thomas Road Baptist Church: Our History." *Jesus First: Thomas Road Baptist Church*. http://www.inmind.com/trbc (3 March 1996).

Conger, Jay A. "The Dark Side of Leadership." *Organizational Dynamics*. (1990): 44 - 55.

Conger, Jay A. and Rabindra N. Kanungo. "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings." *Academy of Management Review*. Vol 12, No 4 (1987): 637 - 647.

Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. New York: The Free Press, 1915.

Falwell, Jerry. "Changing the World One Life at a Time." Thomas Road Baptist Church. Lynchburg, VA. 14 July 1996.

Falwell, Jerry. "God's Plan to Save a Nation." Thomas Road Baptist Church. Lynchburg, VA. 21 July 1996.

Gould, Stephen Jay. "William Jennings Bryan's Last Campaign." *Natural History*. (November 1987): 16 - 26.

The HarperCollins Study Bible, New Revised Standard Version. Wayne A. Meeks et al., eds. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1989.

House, Robert J. and Jane M. Howell. "Personality and Charismatic Leadership."*Leadership Quarterly*. Vol 3, No 2 (1992): 81 - 108.

Hughes, Richard L. et al. *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*. Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1993.

Iannone, Carol. "The Truth About *Inherit the Wind*." *First Things*. (February 1997): 28 - 33.

James, Robison B. Class Lectures from Religion 255: Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism in America.University of Richmond. Spring 1997.

Kantrowitz, Barbara et al. "The Messiah of Waco." *Newsweek*. 15 Mar. 1993: 56 - 58.

Kennedy, John W. "Jerry Falwell's Uncertain Legacy." *Christianity Today*. Vol 40 no 14 (9 Dec. 1996): 62 - 70.

Kets de Vries, Manfred F. R. and Danny Miller. "Narcissism and Leadership: an Object Relations Perspective." *Human Relations*. Vol 38, No 6 (1985): 583 - 601.

Light, Donald, Suzanne Keller and Craig Calhoun. *Sociology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1989.

Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870 - 1925*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Martin, William. *With God on Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America*. New York: Broadway Books, 1996.

Moen, Matthew C. "From Revolution to Evolution: the Changing Nature of the Christian Right." *Sociology of Religion*. Vol 55 no 3 (Fall 1994): 345+.

Morrow, Lance. "In the Name of God." *Time*. 15 Mar. 1993: 24 - 25.

Nadler, David A. and Michael L. Tushman. "Beyond the Charismatic Leader: Leadership and Organizational Change." *The Leader's Companion: Insights on Leadership Through the Ages* . J. Thomas Wren, ed. New York: The Free Press, 1995. pp. 108 - 113.

Niebuhr, Gustav. "Sect is Marked by Schisms and Dire Predictions." *Washington Post*. 1 Mar. 1993: A1, A4.

Reid, Daniel G. et al., eds. *Concise Dictionary of Christianity in America.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1995.

Rifkind, Lawrence J. and Loretta F. Harper. "The Branch Davidians and the Politics of Power and Intimidation." *Journal of American Culture.* Vol 17 No 4. Winter 1994: 65 - 72.

Shamir, Boas. "The Charismatic Relationship: Alternative Explanations and Predictions." *Leadership Quarterly.* Vol 2, No 2 (1991): 81 - 104.

Shamir, Boas et al. "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory." *Organization Science.* Vol 4, No 4 (November 1993): 577 - 591.

Solomon, Robert C. "Leadership, Ethics, and the Emotions: Beyond Charisma." *Working Papers for the Kellogg Leadership Studies Project,* 1996.

Tabor, James D. and Eugene V. Gallagher. *Why Waco? Cults and the Battle for Religious Freedom in America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* Newbury Park, Sage Publications, 1989.

Yukl, Gary. *Leadership in Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994.

Appendix

Jerry Falwell's sermon for Sunday, July 21, 1996.

GOD'S PLAN TO SAVE A NATION

INTRO: Our beloved America is in serious spiritual and moral condition. All of the walls of morality, decency and restraint are down. My heart is very heavy for my country. The Holy Spirit has been stirring my spirit to arise and rebuild the walls. I have been praying earnestly for His guidance as to what I should do. The judgment of God seems to be at the door. Our people no longer appear to care about right and wrong. They disregard the importance of character when voting for political leaders. Our national sensitivity to the sinfulness of sin is virtually gone.

TEXTS: Nehemiah 2:18 "Then I told them of the hand of my God which was good upon me; as also the king's words that he had spoken unto me. And they said, Let us rise up and build. So they strengthened their hands for this good work."
Nehemiah 6:15-16 "So the wall was finished in the twenty and fifth day of the month Elul, in fifty and two days. And it came to pass, that when all our enemies heard thereof, and all the heathen that were about us saw these things, they were much cast down in their own eyes: for they perceived that this work was wrought of our God."

There are four "good things" described in our texts. As I challenge the members of this local church and the Christian family at large to rise up and rebuild the fallen walls, we need these four "good things". First:

1. The Hand of God upon you is always good. Nehemiah 2:18.
Matthew 17:19-21 "Then came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out? And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief: for verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting."

Dr. Ronnie Floyd, pastor of the great First Baptist Church in Springdale, Arkansas, will deliver his anointed message "The Midnight Crisis Before the Coming Millennium" on Monday, October 7th, at 7 PM during our 1996 Super Conference.

Dr. Floyd fasted for 40 days before delivering this message at the Southern Baptist Convention in June. The Holy Spirit is now impacting the nation through this call for national repentance.

II Chronicles 7:14 tells us how to be assured of having God's Hand upon us as we attempt to save America. "If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

2. The king's words were good. Nehemiah 2:18.

(A) We are the salt of the earth.
It is important that believers are good citizens. We must render to Caesar that which is Caesar's. Only in an environment of freedom and good government can we openly and aggressively pursue national reform and repentance. We will observe Citizen's Days on Sunday, September 15th and 22nd. We will register every church member, during the morning service, who is not now eligible to vote in the November 5th election. I am asking 100,000 other evangelical churches in America to join us in this effort. Further, those same 100,000 churches and pastors will be offered bulletin inserts on Sunday, October 20th and 27th and November 3rd. These inserts are Biblical challenges to practice good citizenship by voting on November 5th.

Matthew 5:13-16 "Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savour, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. Ye are the light of the world.

A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

(B) National Committee for the Restoration of the Judeo-Christian Ethic. I will be mobilizing and motivating thousands of pastors to begin working, preaching and praying for revival.

3. Rebuilding the walls was a good work.
(A) The God Save America Crusade. Beginning in September, I will embark on a 52-week campaign across America, calling the nation to repentance, prayer and fasting. I strongly believe that America is perilously close to experiencing the judgment of God.

I do not believe the Republicans or the Democrats have the solution to America's moral and spiritual dilemma. Only a pervasive and national spiritual awakening can prevent us entering the post-Christian era as we go into the 21st century.

These 52 rallies will be held in local church facilities. The Old-Time Gospel Hour and Liberty University will provide the musical-team traveling with me. The Liberty Broadcasting Network will videotape these events and each rally will appear two weeks delayed on the nationwide Old-Time Gospel Hour Television Network. Selection of the 52 rally church sites has already begun. We begin September 9th in Kingsport at Higher Ground Baptist Church, Phil Hoskins, pastor.

In 1976, during the nation's bicentennial year, I took a musical-ministry team of 70 Liberty University students across America for daily and nightly America, Back to God rallies. Arenas, stadiums and churches were filled from city to city. Thousands of pastors joined hands and hearts with us in those

dark days following Watergate and during the failed Carter presidency.

Shortly thereafter, the Moral Majority was born, the so-called religious right was organized, Ronald Reagan was elected president and the battle began to return this nation to moral sanity.

In 1980, we once again launched I Love America rallies on the 50 state capitol steps. The impact was enormous. Thousands of evangelical pastors got involved in voter registration, education and mobilization for the first time in many decades.

By the mid-eighties, several million new voters had been registered and several million other registered voters, who had withdrawn from the political process, were reactivated. The American political scene was changed dramatically and permanently.

I dismantled Moral Majority in 1988 and returned to my first calling as pastor and chancellor of Thomas Road Baptist Church and Liberty University. However, while conducting my Christian ministry, I have continued using this church pulpit, our national television program and many media opportunities to speak out on the moral and social issues.

America is in imminent peril. We are rotting from within. Our families are falling apart at a 50% divorce rate.

Teen pregnancies have reached epidemic proportions at one million per year. Abortion, homosexuality, drugs and violence have become "the American way.

Like Esther who heeded Mordecai's appeal to ask the King to save the Jewish people, we too must approach the King with our pleas for national deliverance. Unlike Esther's dilemma, we have no reason to fear our King's wrath when we approach Him. Our King urges us to come boldly. We must claim II Chronicles 7:14 as we lead our people to repent and cry out to God for national revival.

We pastors and Christian leaders must preach fearlessly against our national sins.

We must preach with power under the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Our only hope lies in the pulpits and pews of our 200,000 Bible-believing churches in America. Over 70 million Americans profess to know Christ through the new birth experience. We have the resources, under God's empowerment, to change the culture.

As I criss-cross America during the next year, I will be calling upon the saints to give God reason to save America. National revival is definitely possible. Nothing is too hard for the Lord.

At this very moment in history, at least three significant phenomena are occurring which indicate we may well be on the verge of national and, perhaps, international spiritual awakening. (1) Revival is breaking out on many Christian college campuses. Liberty University and other colleges are

being mightily impacted. (2) Promise Keepers' explosive ministry among America's men cannot be explained apart from a visitation of God. (3) The recent unprecedented spiritual renaissance within the mammoth Southern Baptist Convention has recovered this mighty movement for the cause of New Testament Christianity. Spiritual renewal is likewise underway in many other denominations. As far as I can determine, nothing quite like this has ever happened in America. Perhaps these fires will continue to burn even more brightly. And God may have more surprises for us. The God Save America campaign will focus on national revival which originates in God's churches.

(B) The Renaissance of the Sunday School. The Sunday School in America is in serious decline. I have committed the resources of Liberty University, Thomas Road Baptist Church and this pastor to reverse that trend. It is my strong conviction that the Sunday School is the primary soul-winning and teaching arm of the local church. I am inviting you in this church and watching by television, plus the pastoral and teaching staff of your church to attend the 1996 Super Conference as Dr. Elmer Towns and I continue our ministry theme on The Renaissance of the Sunday School. My lectures will focus on How to Double Your Attendance and Offerings in One Year.

Those persons who attended my seminars on this subject last year will attend Dr. Towns' advanced sessions this year on Taking Your Sunday School Into the 21st Century.

I will give each person in my seminars a free packet of tapes and notes which can be carried home to be used as tools in doubling your attendance and offerings in the next twelve months. Presently, hundreds of pastors and churches are involved in our efforts to reactivate the Sunday School in America. Pastors and lay people alike are catching the vision and are dedicating themselves to build growing and soul-winning Sunday Schools.

The renowned Mamie McCullough will join forces with our Bev Lowry in conducting what we believe will be our largest Ladies Conference ever.

Drs. Henry Morris, John Morris, Duane Gish and Harold Willmington will conduct the exciting Back To Genesis Conference. The Book of Genesis is the foundation of true Christianity and our 1996 speakers are the best in the field of creationism.

Dr. Robert Webber, America's leading authority on praise and worship in the local church, will lead that Conference.

Dr. Steve Troxel will lead the Media in Ministry Seminar for three hours academic credit, and Drs. Ellen Black, Karen Parker and Rebecca Carwile will lead the Christian Education Workshop. The Church Ministry, Childrens Ministry, Counseling, and Youth Ministry Workshops will be conducted by our Thomas Road Church Staff.

The featured evening speakers are: Drs. Jerry Vines, Ronnie Floyd, John W. Rawlings, Bailey Smith, Danny Lovett and Duane Gish. Robbie Hiner will lead a spectacular musical ministry featuring: John Starnes, Doug Oldham, Kendra Cook, Bob and Jeanne Johnson, Sounds of Liberty, the Old-Time Gospel Hour

Trio (Robbie, Mary Hiner Elness and Shari Falwell) and the brand new 400-voice Super Conference Choir and 60-piece orchestra.

4. It was good that God received the glory for the restoration.
Nehemiah 6:16 "And it came to pass, that when all our enemies heard thereof, and all the heathen that were about us saw these things, they were much cast down in their own eyes: for they perceived that this work was wrought of our God."

(A) Natural disasters and major catastrophes may be God's warning. The World Trade Center, Oklahoma City, Waco, hurricanes, tornadoes, flooding, earthquakes, TWA flight 800, etc.,etc.

(B) God can suddenly invade and change the culture.
Malachi 3:1-3 "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness."